arXiv:1107.2280v2 [math.PR] 26 Jan 2012

The asymptotic shape, large deviations and dynamical stability in first-passage percolation on cones

Daniel Ahlberg
University of Gothenburg, and
Chalmers University of Technology
`ahlberg.daniel@gmail.com`

January 30, 2012

Abstract

This paper presents a three-fold extension of the Shape Theorem in first-passage percolation. Firstly, we show that the convergence holds not only almost surely and in L^1, but also completely. For this, we deduce certain large deviation estimates assuming finite power moments. Secondly, we prove that there are no exceptional times at which the almost sure convergence fails, when edges update their values according to independent Poisson clocks. Finally, we prove that all of the above extends to cone-like subgraphs of the $\mathbb{Z}^d$ lattice; Their associated asymptotic shapes can be expressed in terms of the asymptotic shape of the lattice.

Keywords: First-passage percolation, shape theorem, complete convergence, large deviations, dynamical stability.

1 Introduction

First considered by Hammersley and Welsh (1965), first-passage percolation is a process defined on a graph $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}_\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{E}_\mathcal{G})$ to which non-negative i.i.d. random variables $\{\tau_e\}_{e\in\mathcal{E}_\mathcal{G}}$ have been assigned to its edges. The process can be interpreted as an infection started at the origin of the graph, and which to spread along the edges of the graph with delay given by the random variables. The random variables are thus commonly referred to as *passage times*. To avoid trivialities, we assume throughout this paper that the passage-time distribution does not concentrate all mass at a single point.

One of the main achievements in first-passage percolation is known as the *Shape Theorem* (cf. Theorem 1.1), and describes the almost sure macroscopic behaviour of an infection growing on the $\mathbb{Z}^d$ nearest neighbour graph, where $d \geq 2$. The $\mathbb{Z}^d$ nearest neighbour graph, also referred to as the $\mathbb{Z}^d$ *lattice*, is the graph whose vertices are the points in $\mathbb{Z}^d$ and where every pair of vertices at Euclidean distance one are joined by an edge. The two main results of this paper together give a three-fold extension of the Shape Theorem. The first, Theorem 1.2, says that a statement analogous to the Shape Theorem holds for certain cone-like subgraphs of the $\mathbb{Z}^d$ lattice. Moreover, it gives sufficient conditions for the convergence to hold almost surely, in

L^1 and completely. The second, Theorem 1.6, is a dynamically stable version of the Shape Theorem. For this a dynamical version of first-passage percolation is introduced, in which edges update their values according to i.i.d. Poisson clocks. This dynamics is analogous to the one introduced by Häggström, Peres, and Steif (1997) for bond percolation, and will be properly presented below. As will be emphasized, the time dimension in which edges flip should not be confused with the interpretation of the random values assigned to the edges as 'times'.

A few words should be said about the relevance of this study. The concept complete convergence is not frequently figuring in the percolation literature. However, since introduced by Hsu and Robbins (1947), it has been studied thoroughly in the classical study of random sequences, renewal theory and alike (see e.g. Gut (2005)). A random sequence $\{X_n\}_{n\geq 1}$ is said to *converge completely* to X as $n \to \infty$ if

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathrm{P}\big(|X_n - X| > \epsilon\big) < \infty, \quad \text{for all } \epsilon > 0. \tag{1.1}$$

Complete convergence implies almost sure convergence via Borel-Cantelli's lemma, and provides a bound on the rate by which X_n converges to X in probability. The fact that first-passage percolation essentially is the graph theoretical analogue of a renewal process, makes complete convergence relevant also here.

Considering first-passage percolation on subgraphs of the lattice is a natural extension. However, additional motivation comes from that it is the first step towards *inhomogeneous* first-passage percolation, where different regions of the lattice (such as upper and lower half-space) are assigned values from distinct distributions. The inhomogeneous case is not studied further in this paper.

Let us next be more specific about the objects we do study. Let a *path* refer to an alternating sequence of vertices and edges; $v_0, e_1, v_1, \ldots, e_n, v_n$, beginning and ending with a vertex, such that v_k is the endpoint of the edges e_k and e_{k+1} that precedes and follows v_k. The vertices v_0 and v_n are referred to as endpoints of the path. A path with endpoints u and v will be referred to as a path from u to v. We will repeatedly abuse notation and identify a path with its set of edges. For a path Γ, we define the passage time of Γ as $T(\Gamma) := \sum_{e\in\Gamma} \tau_e$, and define the *passage time*, or *first-passage time*, between two vertices $u, v \in \mathcal{V}_\mathcal{G}$ as

$$T(u,v) := \inf\{T(\Gamma) : \Gamma \text{ is a path from } u \text{ to } v\}.$$

$T(u,v)$ should be thought of as the time it takes an infection started at u to reach v. Starting with a single infected vertex at the origin $\mathbf{0} \in \mathcal{V}_\mathcal{G}$, the spatial propagation, i.e., the set of vertices reached by time t is given by

$$\mathcal{W}_t := \big\{v \in \mathcal{V}_\mathcal{G} : T(\mathbf{0}, v) \leq t\big\}.$$

When the underlying discrete structure is given by the $\mathbb{Z}^d$ lattice, we will for practical reasons extend the definition of $T(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})$ from $\mathbb{Z}^d$ to $\mathbb{R}^d$. For $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we assigning $T(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})$ the passage time $T(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{y}^*)$, where $\mathbf{x}^*$ and $\mathbf{y}^*$ denotes the two points in $\mathbb{Z}^d$ closest to $\mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{y}$, respectively (choosing the point closest to the origin in case of a tie, say). The definition of $\mathcal{W}_t$ extends consequently to let $\mathcal{W}_t$ contain all points $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $T(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{x}) \leq t$.

1.1 The Shape Theorem

An important breakthrough was achived by Kingman (1968) and his Subadditive Ergodic Theorem. The theorem implies that for any $\hat{\mathbf{z}}$ of the form $\hat{\mathbf{z}} = \mathbf{z}/|\mathbf{z}|$, for some $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$,

$$\exists\, \mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{z}}) := \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{T(\mathbf{0}, n\hat{\mathbf{z}})}{n} = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\mathrm{E}\left[T(\mathbf{0}, n\hat{\mathbf{z}})\right]}{n}, \quad \text{almost surely and in } L^1, \tag{1.2}$$

under the assumption that $\mathrm{E}[Y] < \infty$, where

$$Y = \min(\tau_1, \tau_2, \dots, \tau_{2d}), \tag{1.3}$$

and $\tau_1, \tau_2, \dots, \tau_{2d}$ are independent and distributed as τ_e. The limit $\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\cdot)$ that figures in (1.2) is referred to as the *time constant.* Given the radial convergence in (1.2), a fair amount of additional work provides the asymptotic growth in all directions simultaneously. In particular, if $\mathrm{E}\left[Y^d\right] < \infty$, then

$$\limsup_{\mathbf{z}\in\mathbb{Z}^d\colon |\mathbf{z}|\to\infty} \left| \frac{T(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{z})}{|\mathbf{z}|} - \mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\mathbf{z}/|\mathbf{z}|) \right| = 0, \quad \text{almost surely.} \tag{1.4}$$

Alternatively, we can present (1.4) in terms of how closely $t^{-1}\mathcal{W}_t$ resembles the set

$$\mathcal{W}^* := \left\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d : |\mathbf{x}| \le \mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\mathbf{x}/|\mathbf{x}|)^{-1}\right\}.$$

(As will be seen in Section 2, $\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\cdot)$ extends continuously to all unit vectors in $\mathbb{S}^{d-1}$.) Stated in terms of spatial propagation, the result is known as the Shape Theorem and due to Cox and Durrett (1981), inspired by a result of Richardson (1973).

Theorem 1.1 (Shape Theorem)**.** *Consider first-passage percolation on $\mathbb{Z}^d$ with i.i.d. passage times such that $\mathrm{E}\left[Y^d\right] < \infty$, for Y defined as in (1.3). If $\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\mathbf{e}_1) > 0$, then, for all $\epsilon > 0$, almost surely,*

$$(1-\epsilon)\mathcal{W}^* \subset \frac{1}{t}\mathcal{W}_t \subset (1+\epsilon)\mathcal{W}^*, \quad \textit{for } t \textit{ large enough.}$$

If $\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\mathbf{e}_1) = 0$, then for every compact set K in $\mathbb{R}^d$, almost surely,

$$K \subset \frac{1}{t}\mathcal{W}_t, \quad \textit{for } t \textit{ large enough.}$$

Theorem 1.1 can be seen to be equivalent to (1.4) via an inversion argument. For the purpose of this paper, it will be more convenient to consider limits of the form in (1.4). It was shown by Kesten (1986) that

$$\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\mathbf{e}_1) = 0 \text{ if and only if } \mathrm{P}(\tau_e = 0) \ge p_c(d),$$

where $p_c(d)$ denotes the critical probability for independent bond percolation on the $\mathbb{Z}^d$ lattice. Moreover, it is known that if $\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) = 0$ for some $\hat{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$, then it does for all. In the regime $\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\mathbf{e}_1) > 0$, the shape $\mathcal{W}^*$ can be seen to be compact, convex and to have nonempty interior.

1.2 A shape theorem for subgraphs

The Shape Theorem gives a Law of Large Numbers for first-passage percolation on the $\mathbb{Z}^d$ lattice. In this paper we will show that a similar limit result can be achieved for certain subgraphs of the $\mathbb{Z}^d$ lattice. A subgraphs $\mathcal{G}$ of the $\mathbb{Z}^d$ lattice will be called *induced* if any two vertices in $\mathcal{G}$ are connected by an edge if and only if the same thing holds in the $\mathbb{Z}^d$ lattice. An induced subgraph is uniquely determined by its set of vertices. Subsets of $\mathbb{Z}^d$ is in turn uniquely determined by a subsets of $\mathbb{R}^d$. Thus, we say that $\mathcal{G}$ is the subgraph of the $\mathbb{Z}^d$ lattice *induced by* $V \in \mathbb{R}^d$, if $\mathcal{G}$ is an induced subgraph of the $\mathbb{Z}^d$ lattice and $\mathcal{V}_\mathcal{G} = V \cap \mathbb{Z}^d$.

Let $B(\mathbf{y}, r) = \big\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d : |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}| \leq r\big\}$ denote the closed Euclidean ball. We will in this paper focus on subgraphs $\mathcal{G}$ of the $\mathbb{Z}^d$ lattice induced by sets of the form $\bigcup_{a \geq 0} B\big(a\hat{\mathbf{x}}, \omega(a)\big)$, for some $\hat{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1} := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d : |\mathbf{x}| = 1\}$ and $\omega : [0, \infty) \to [0, \infty)$. Note that when $\omega(a) = r \cdot a$ for some $r \in (0, 1)$, then $\mathcal{G}$ is simply a d-dimensional cone. One of the main results of this paper is the following extension of (1.4) (and hence the Shape Theorem). The constant R_d that figures in the statement of the theorem will be explained and quantified in Lemma 2.4.

Theorem 1.2. *For any $d \geq 2$ there exists a universal constant R_d such that the following holds. Let $\hat{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ and let $\omega : [0, \infty) \to [0, \infty)$ be a convex or concave function such that $\omega(a) \to \infty$, as $a \to \infty$. Consider first-passage percolation on the subgraph $\mathcal{G}$ of the $\mathbb{Z}^d$ lattice induced by $\bigcup_{a \geq 0} B\big(a\hat{\mathbf{x}}, \omega(a) + R_d\big)$.*

a) If $\mathrm{E}[\tau_e] < \infty$, *then* $$\limsup_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{V}_\mathcal{G} \colon |\mathbf{z}| \to \infty} \mathrm{E}\left|\frac{T(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{z})}{|\mathbf{z}|} - \mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\mathbf{z}/|\mathbf{z}|)\right| = 0.$$

b) If $\mathrm{E}[Y^d] < \infty$, *then* $$\limsup_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{V}_\mathcal{G} \colon |\mathbf{z}| \to \infty} \left|\frac{T(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{z})}{|\mathbf{z}|} - \mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\mathbf{z}/|\mathbf{z}|)\right| = 0, \quad \textit{almost surely.}$$

c) If $\mathrm{E}[Y^{d+1}] < \infty$, *then* $$\sum_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{V}_\mathcal{G}} \mathrm{P}\left(\left|\frac{T(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{z})}{|\mathbf{z}|} - \mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\mathbf{z}/|\mathbf{z}|)\right| > \epsilon\right) < \infty, \quad \textit{for all } \epsilon > 0.$$

We continue with a series of remarks on the statement of Theorem 1.2. As mentioned above, $\omega(a) = r \cdot a$ gives rise to a cone in the classical sense when $r \in (0, 1)$. When $r = 1$, $\mathcal{G}$ is the subgraph induced by the half-space $\{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{Z}^d : \langle \mathbf{z}, \hat{\mathbf{x}} \rangle \geq -R_d\}$, where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denotes inner product, and for $r > 1$, $\mathcal{G}$ equals the $\mathbb{Z}^d$ lattice. Hence, part *b)* extends (1.4).

The convergence in part *c)* is what we refer to as complete convergence, in analogy with (1.1). We will prove part *b)* and *c)* of Theorem 1.2 under the stronger condition that $\mathrm{E}[\tau_e^2] < \infty$. This will save us from a few additional technicalities, which can be found in the paper of Cox and Durrett (1981). The necessary steps for the proof to go through without the stronger condition are indicated in Remark 6.4.

The condition $\mathrm{E}[\tau_e] < \infty$ for the L^1-convergence in part *a)* to hold can not be relaxed in general. However, it is not hard to see that if the limsup is taken over $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{V}_\mathcal{G} \cap \bigcup_{a \geq 0} B\big(a\hat{\mathbf{x}}, \omega(a)\big)$ instead of over $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{V}_\mathcal{G}$, then $\mathrm{E}[Y] < \infty$ is sufficient. In particular, $\mathrm{E}[Y] < \infty$ is sufficient when $\mathcal{G}$ equals the $\mathbb{Z}^d$ lattice.

The case when $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ is of the form $\mathbf{z}/|\mathbf{z}|$, for some $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, and $\omega(a) \equiv K - R_d$ was treated in Ahlberg (2010). Also in this case the limit exists and satisfies $\mu_K(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) > \mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{x}})$ for all $K \geq R_d$.

Indeed $\mu_K(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) \to \mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{x}})$ as $K \to \infty$ (cf. Proposition 2.9), which explains the presence of $\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\cdot)$ in Theorem 1.2.

For $\hat{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ and $r \in (0,1)$, let $\mathcal{C}(\hat{\mathbf{x}},r) := \bigcup_{a\geq 0} B(a\hat{\mathbf{x}}, r\cdot a)$. The cone $\mathcal{C}(\hat{\mathbf{x}},r)$ is with elementary trigonometry found to have radius equal to $\frac{r}{\sqrt{1-r^2}}\cdot a$ at distance a from its tip. Consequently, an alternative way to generate $\mathcal{C}(\hat{\mathbf{x}},r)$ is as the volume obtained when the function $g(a) = \frac{r}{\sqrt{1-r^2}}\cdot a$, for $a \geq 0$, is rotated around the axis $\{a\hat{\mathbf{x}}\}_{a\in\mathbb{R}}$. The other way around, the volume obtained when the function $g(a) = r\cdot a$, for $a \geq 0$ and some $r > 0$, is rotated around the axis $\{a\hat{\mathbf{x}}\}_{a\in\mathbb{R}}$ equals $\mathcal{C}\big(\hat{\mathbf{x}}, \frac{r}{\sqrt{1+r^2}}\big)$. In fact, for any non-decreasing convex function $g : [0,\infty) \to [0,\infty)$, there is a convex function $\omega : [0,\infty) \to [0,\infty)$ such that the rotation volume obtained when g is rotated around the axis $\{a\hat{\mathbf{x}}\}_{a\in\mathbb{R}}$ equals $\bigcup_{a\geq 0} B\big(a\hat{\mathbf{x}}, \omega(a)\big)$.

Finally, the following observation is made in connection to Theorem 1.2. Recall that the subcritical regime of bond percolation on the $\mathbb{Z}^d$ lattice coincides with $\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\mathbf{e}_1) > 0$, that is $\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\mathbf{e}_1) > 0$ if and only if $\mathrm{P}(\tau_e = 0) < p_c(d)$. In addition, $\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\mathbf{e}_1) > 0$ coincides with linear growth of the spatial propagation of the infection, via the Shape Theorem. This is not true for all graphs. Consider the subgraph of the square lattice induced by the set $\big\{(x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : 0 \leq y \leq a\log(1+x)\big\}$, for some $a \in \mathbb{R}_+$. Grimmett (1983) proved that for each $a \in \mathbb{R}_+$ the critical probability for bond percolation on this graph lies strictly between 1/2 and 1. Although this graph is not treated by Theorem 1.2, it is by similar means easy to see that $\lim_{n\to\infty} T(\mathbf{0}, n\mathbf{e}_1)/n = \mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\mathbf{e}_1)$, almost surely, also for this graphs. In particular, we conclude that the subcritical regime of bond percolation does not coincide with the regime in which $\lim_{n\to\infty} T(\mathbf{0}, n\mathbf{e}_1)/n$ is almost surely positive.

1.3 Large deviations

Hsu and Robbins (1947) proved that the sequence of arithmetic averages of i.i.d. random variables converges completely to its common mean, given that their variance is finite. That this is also necessary was proved by Erdős. We will from an extention of their results (cf. Theorem 3.1) deduce the following result which we will need to prove the large deviations estimate in part *c)* of Theorem 1.2.

Proposition 1.3. *Let* $\hat{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ *and* $\alpha \geq 1$. *Consider first-passage percolation on the* $\mathbb{Z}^d$ *lattice with* $\mathrm{E}[Y^\alpha] < \infty$. *Then,*

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^{\alpha-2}\mathrm{P}\Big(T(\mathbf{0}, n\hat{\mathbf{x}}) > \big(\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) + \epsilon\big)n\Big) < \infty, \quad \textit{for any } \epsilon > 0.$$

This result is a kind of large deviations estimate for first-passage times above the time constant, and as we will see (cf. Proposition 4.1), it also holds for subgraphs of the $\mathbb{Z}^d$ lattice. We will also prove a large deviations estimate below the time constant, in which case we have exponential decay.

Proposition 1.4. *Consider first-passage percolation on the* $\mathbb{Z}^d$ *lattice. For any* $\epsilon > 0$, *there are* $\alpha = \alpha(\epsilon) < \infty$ *and* $\beta = \beta(\epsilon) > 0$ *such that*

$$\mathrm{P}\Big(T(\mathbf{0}, n\hat{\mathbf{x}}) < (\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) - \epsilon)n\Big) \leq \alpha e^{-\beta n}, \quad \textit{for all } n \geq 0 \textit{ and } \hat{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}.$$

Proposition 1.4 extends a result by Grimmett and Kesten (1984) ($d = 2$) and Kesten (1986) ($d \geq 2$). They treat the case when $\hat{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{e}_1$. The convergence obtained in Proposition 1.3 does not seem to be previously known under the given hypothesis. However, Grimmett and Kesten also show that $\mathrm{P}\big(T(\mathbf{0}, n\mathbf{e}_1) > (\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\mathbf{e}_1) + \epsilon)n\big)$ decays at least exponentially, but under the stronger assumption that $\mathrm{E}[e^{\gamma\tau_e}] < \infty$ for some $\gamma > 0$. First-passage times as defined above are sometimes referred to as point-to-point passage times. Related results have also been obtained by Chow and Zhang (2003) for so-called face-to-face passage times, and by Garet and Marchand (2007) for the chemical distance in bond percolation clusters. We should mention that it does not follow from the proof we present whether $\mathrm{E}[Y^\alpha] < \infty$ is a necessary condition for the conclusion of Proposition 1.3 or not.

In fact, it is possible to prove something stronger that Proposition 1.4. We will introduce what could be referred to as *point-to-shape* passage times, which we define as

$$T_{0,n}^{\mathcal{W}} := \inf\left\{T(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{z}) : \ \mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{Z}^d \text{ with } |\mathbf{z}| \geq \frac{n}{\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\mathbf{z}/|\mathbf{z}|)}\right\}.$$

This definition only makes sense when $\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\cdot) > 0$, which is known to hold when $\mathrm{P}(\tau_e = 0) < p_c(d)$, where $p_c(d)$ denotes the critical probability in bond percolations on the $\mathbb{Z}^d$ lattice. For these cases, $T_{0,n}^{\mathcal{W}}$ equals the time it takes to reach a vertex at the boundary of, or outside the blow-up $n\mathcal{W}^*$ of the shape $\mathcal{W}^*$. In the light of the Shape Theorem, it natural that (see Section 3)

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{T_{0,n}^{\mathcal{W}}}{n} = 1, \quad \text{almost surely.} \tag{1.5}$$

In fact, the following is true, from which Proposition 1.4 comes as an easy corollary. Our proof of this result is heavily influenced by the proof presented in Kesten (1986) for the case $\hat{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{e}_1$ of Proposition 1.4.

Proposition 1.5. *For any $\epsilon > 0$ there exists $\alpha = \alpha(\epsilon) < \infty$ and $\beta = \beta(\epsilon) > 0$ such that*

$$\mathrm{P}\Big(T_{0,n}^{\mathcal{W}} < (1-\epsilon)n\Big) \leq \alpha e^{-\beta n}, \quad \textit{for all } n \geq 0.$$

1.4 Dynamical first-passage percolation

We will also consider a dynamical version of first-passage percolation. This is inspired by so-called dynamical percolation introduced by Häggström et al. (1997). From bond percolation, dynamical (bond) percolation is obtained by allowing the edges of a graph to flip between 'open' and 'closed' according to i.i.d. Poisson clocks. At each fixed time, an infinite open component exists with probability either 0 or 1 (depending on the probability of an edge being open). Is this property dynamically stable in the sense that for almost every realization we will see an infinite open component either present or absent at all times? This question was first studied in Häggström et al. (1997), and continued by Benjamini, Kalai, and Schramm (1999), Schramm and Steif (2010) and Garban, Pete, and Schramm (2010). It is not hard to conclude that away from criticality, the answer is 'yes'. However, at criticality, the $\mathbb{Z}^2$ lattice exhibits exceptional times at which an infinite open component exists, as proved by Garban et al. (2010). In a related work, Benjamini, Häggström, Peres, and Steif (2003) consider similar questions in the context of i.i.d. sequences.

Analogously, we obtain a dynamical version of first-passage percolation by assigning i.i.d. passage times, together with independent Poisson clocks, to the edges of a graph $\mathcal{G}$. When a clock rings, the passage time of the corresponding edge is resampled from the same distribution. More formally, associate independently to each edge e of the underlying graph a random process $\{\tau_e(s)\}_{s\geq 0}$ defined as follows. Given non-negative i.i.d. random variables $\{\tau_e^{(j)}\}_{e\in\mathcal{E}_\mathcal{G},j\geq 1}$ and i.i.d. rate 1 exponentially distributed random variables $\{\xi_e^{(j)}\}_{e\in\mathcal{E}_\mathcal{G},j\geq 1}$, let $\xi_e^{(0)}=0$ for each e, and define for all $e\in\mathcal{E}_\mathcal{G}$ and $s\geq 0$

$$\tau_e(s):=\tau_e^{(j)},\quad \text{for} \sum_{k=0}^{j-1}\xi_e^{(k)}\leq s<\sum_{k=0}^{j}\xi_e^{(k)}.$$

By construction, the processes $\{\tau_e(s)\}_{s\geq 0}$ are independent for different edges, and $\{\tau_e(s)\}_{s\geq 0}$ will sometimes be referred to as the *dynamical passage time* of the edge e. If $\tau_e^{(j)}$ has probability measure ν, then for any $s\geq 0$, the distribution of $\{\tau_e(s)\}_{e\in\mathcal{E}_\mathcal{G}}$ is given by the product measure $\nu^{\mathcal{E}_\mathcal{G}}$. Let for each $s\geq 0$, $T^{(s)}(u,v)$ denote the passage time between the points u and v with respect to $\{\tau_e(s)\}_{e\in\mathcal{E}_\mathcal{G}}$. It follows that also

$$T^{(0)}(u,v)\overset{d}{=}T^{(s)}(u,v),\quad \text{for all } s\geq 0.$$

It is natural to think of dynamical passage times as evolving with time. This gives us two time dimensions. To better picture the dynamical setting, it may help not to think of $\tau_e(s)$ as the *time*, but as the *cost* related to crossing e at time s. Then $T^{(s)}(u,v)$ is interpreted as the minimal cost to travel between u and v at time s, and $\big\{T^{(s)}(u,v)\big\}_{s\geq 0}$ as the evolution over time of the cost for the passage between u and v.

On the $\mathbb{Z}^d$ lattice (1.4) states that if $\mathrm{E}[Y^d]<\infty$, then

$$\mathrm{P}\left(\limsup_{\mathbf{z}\in\mathbb{Z}^d\colon|\mathbf{z}|\to\infty}\left|\frac{T^{(s)}(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{z})}{|\mathbf{z}|}-\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\mathbf{z}/|\mathbf{z}|)\right|=0\right)=1,\quad \text{for each } s\geq 0.$$

An application of Fubini's theorem strengthens this to

$$\mathrm{P}\left(\limsup_{\mathbf{z}\in\mathbb{Z}^d\colon|\mathbf{z}|\to\infty}\left|\frac{T^{(s)}(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{z})}{|\mathbf{z}|}-\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\mathbf{z}/|\mathbf{z}|)\right|=0 \text{ for Lebesgue-a.e. } s\geq 0\right)=1.$$

Our next result states that this can be strengthend to hold for *every* $s\geq 0$. The Shape Theorem is so to say *dynamically stable* with respect to the dynamics introduced. The same is true for the almost sure convergence in part *b)* of Theorem 1.2.

Theorem 1.6. *For any $d\geq 2$ there exists a universal constant R_d such that the following holds. Let $\hat{\mathbf{x}}\in\mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ and let $\omega:[0,\infty)\to[0,\infty)$ be a convex or concave function such that $\omega(a)\to\infty$, as $a\to\infty$. Consider first-passage percolation on the subgraph $\mathcal{G}$ of the $\mathbb{Z}^d$ lattice induced by $\bigcup_{a\geq 0}B\big(a\hat{\mathbf{x}},\omega(a)+R_d\big)$. If $\mathrm{E}[Y^d]<\infty$, then*

$$\mathrm{P}\left(\limsup_{\mathbf{z}\in\mathcal{V}_\mathcal{G}\colon|\mathbf{z}|\to\infty}\left|\frac{T^{(s)}(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{z})}{|\mathbf{z}|}-\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\mathbf{z}/|\mathbf{z}|)\right|=0 \textit{ for all } s\geq 0\right)=1.$$

Like part *b)* and *c)* of Theorem 1.2, we will prove Theorem 1.6 under the somewhat stronger assumption that $\mathrm{E}[\tau_e^2]<\infty$. See also Remark 6.4.

1.5 Outline of proof and paper

The two main results of this paper, Theorem 1.2 and 1.6, together extends the Shape Theorem in three different directions. The three extensions are consequences of the following tasks:

1. Prove that the convergence in (1.4) holds almost surely, in L^1 and completely.
2. Prove that the almost sure convergence in (1.4) is dynamically stable.
3. Prove that the convergence also holds on the cone-like subgraphs we consider.

We will prove task 1-3 step by step. We recall the reader that the almost sure convergence in (1.4) is equivalent to the Shape Theorem. The L^1-convergence is normally not emphasized, but can be deduced in the same way. The novelty in task 1 is the complete convergence. Note that, for the $\mathbb{Z}^d$ lattice, complete convergence would follow easily from standard large deviation principles under the stronger assumption that $\mathrm{E}[e^{\alpha\tau_e}] < \infty$ for some $\alpha > 0$.

The accomplishment of the three tasks will proceed along the following lines.

Section 3 Obtain the large deviation estimate in radial directions given by Proposition 1.3 and 1.4. This is sufficient, together with existing proofs of the Shape Theorem, to obtain complete convergence in (1.4) under the condition that $\mathrm{E}[Y^{d+1}] < \infty$. This would complete the first of the three tasks above.

Section 4 Show that the radial almost sure and L^1-convergence in (1.2) extends to cone-like subgraphs of the lattice. In the same way we extend the large deviations estimate obtained in Section 3. The results are easily obtained for rational directions, i.e., $\hat{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathbb{U}^{d-1}$, whereas the general case, $\hat{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$, is harder. With this we take the first step towards an analogue of (1.4) for the cone-like graphs in consideration.

Section 5 Here we prove that the almost sure convergence in radial directions, which is given in (1.2) and extended in Section 4, is dynamically stable. A dynamically stable version of (1.2) is sufficient, again together with existing proofs of the Shape Theorem, to obtain a dynamically stable version of (1.4) under the condition that $\mathrm{E}[Y^d] < \infty$. This completes the second task.

Section 6 Finally, we complete the proof of Theorem 1.2 and 1.6. In addition to the results obtained in Section 4 and 5, the missing piece is a geometric argument needed to prove Lemma 6.2. The assumption $\mathrm{E}[\tau_e^2] < \infty$ is used in the proof of Lemma 6.2, and only there. That assumption is made to avoid additional technicalities. As mentioned, under even stronger moment assumption, also the geometric argument is redundant. Together with the work carried out in Section 4, the third task is accomplished.

First of all, we dedicate Section 2 to recall some additional facts about first-passage percolation, as well as introducing some notation, that will recur in the rest of the paper.

2 Preliminaries

Consider first-passage percolation on the $\mathbb{Z}^d$ lattice. For the purpose of this paper it will suffice to consider the case when $\mathrm{E}[Y] < \infty$, where Y is as defined in (1.3). That $\mathrm{E}[Y] < \infty$ is sufficient to obtain $\mathrm{E}\big[T(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{z})\big] < \infty$ for any $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ is given by Proposition 2.5 below. An very central concept in first-passage percolation is the *subadditive property*, that is, that

$$T(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \leq T(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) + T(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{y}), \quad \text{for any } \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

The property is immediate from the definition of first-passage times, and holds for first-passage percolation on any graph. Let $\mathbb{U}^{d-1} \subseteq \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ denote the set of $\hat{\mathbf{z}} \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ such that $\hat{\mathbf{z}} = \mathbf{z}/|\mathbf{z}|$ for some $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. In (1.2) the time constant $\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{z}})$ was defined for $\hat{\mathbf{z}} \in \mathbb{U}^{d-1}$ as the almost sure limit of $T(\mathbf{0}, n\hat{\mathbf{z}})/n$ as $n \to \infty$. Existence of the limit is a consequence of the Subadditive Ergodic Theorem, and crucially based on the subadditive property. Alternatively, $\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{z}})$ equals $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathrm{E}\big[T(\mathbf{0}, n\hat{\mathbf{z}})\big]/n = \inf_{n\geq 1} \mathrm{E}\big[T(\mathbf{0}, n\mathbf{z})\big]/n$. This is a more elementary consequence of the convergence of real-valued subadditive sequences, realized already by Fekete (1923). Existence of the limit is easily extended to $\hat{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ as follows. By subadditivity and lattice symmetry,

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \frac{\mathrm{E}\big[T(\mathbf{0}, n\hat{\mathbf{x}})\big]}{n} - \frac{\mathrm{E}\big[T(\mathbf{0}, n\hat{\mathbf{y}})\big]}{n} \right| &\leq \left| \frac{\mathrm{E}\big[T(n\hat{\mathbf{x}}, n\hat{\mathbf{y}})\big]}{n} \right| \\
&\leq \frac{\mathrm{E}\big[T(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{e}_1)\big] \|n\hat{\mathbf{x}} - n\hat{\mathbf{y}}\|_1}{n} \\
&\leq d\,\mathrm{E}\big[T(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{e}_1)\big] |\hat{\mathbf{x}} - \hat{\mathbf{y}}|.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

Now, assume that $\hat{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{y}} \in \mathbb{U}^{d-1}$, let $n \to \infty$, and conclude that

$$\exists\, \mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) := \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\mathrm{E}\big[T(\mathbf{0}, n\hat{\mathbf{x}})\big]}{n} = \lim_{\hat{\mathbf{y}} \in \mathbb{U}^{d-1}\colon \hat{\mathbf{y}} \to \hat{\mathbf{x}}} \mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{y}}), \quad \text{for any } \hat{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}. \tag{2.2}$$

From (2.1) we also conclude, letting $M = d\,\mathrm{E}\big[T(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{e}_1)\big]$ and sending n to infinity, that

$$\big|\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) - \mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{y}})\big| \leq M|\hat{\mathbf{x}} - \hat{\mathbf{y}}|, \quad \text{for all } \hat{\mathbf{x}}, \hat{\mathbf{y}} \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}. \tag{2.3}$$

Hence, the time constant is Lipschitz continuous on $\mathbb{S}^{d-1}$. The time constant is also known to be continuous with respect to weak convergence of passage-time distributions. This fact will be used in order to prove dynamical stability in Theorem 1.6. Let $V, F_1, F_2, \ldots, F_\infty$ denote passage time distribution functions, and let $\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}^F$ denote the time constant on the $\mathbb{Z}^d$ lattice associated with the distribution F.

Proposition 2.1 (Cox and Kesten (1981))**.** *If $F_n \to F_\infty$ weakly, then for every $\hat{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$*

$$\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}^{F_n}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) \to \mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}^{F_\infty}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}), \quad \textit{as } n \to \infty.$$

Remark 2.2. The proposition was proved, for $d = 2$ and $\hat{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{e}_1$, in Cox (1980) under the assumption that there exists a distribution $V \leq F_n$, for all n, with $\int_0^\infty \big(1 - V(u)\big)du < \infty$. That condition was removed in Cox and Kesten (1981). The proof extends to all $d \geq 2$ and directions (cf. Kesten (1986, Theorem 6.9 and Remark 6.18)). □

2.1 The trivial coupling

There is a very natural coupling between passages times on a graph and its subgraphs. We will throughout this paper assume passage times on a graph are coupled with passage times on its subgraphs in this way. We are interested in the $\mathbb{Z}^d$ lattice and subgraphs thereof. We will next present the coupling, and some notation, which will be in force for the rest of this paper.

Let $\mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{Z}^d}$ denote the edge set of the $\mathbb{Z}^d$ lattice, and let $\{\tau_e\}_{e\in\mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{Z}^d}}$ be a family of i.i.d. nonnegative random variables associated with the edges of the $\mathbb{Z}^d$ lattice. Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a subgraph of the $\mathbb{Z}^d$ lattice, with vertex set $\mathcal{V}_\mathcal{G}$ and edge set $\mathcal{E}_\mathcal{G}$. In particular, $\mathcal{V}_\mathcal{G}\subseteq\mathbb{Z}^d$ and $\mathcal{E}_\mathcal{G}\subseteq\mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{Z}^d}$. For $\mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{y}$ in $\mathcal{V}_\mathcal{G}$, let $T_\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})$ denote the first-passage time on $\mathcal{G}$ between $\mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{y}$ with respect to the set of passage times $\{\tau_e\}_{e\in\mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{Z}^d}}$. This generates a simultaneous coupling of first-passage times among all subgraphs of the $\mathbb{Z}^d$ lattice. In particular, if $\mathcal{G}_1$ is a subgraph of the $\mathbb{Z}^d$ lattice, and $\mathcal{G}_2$ is a further subgraph of $\mathcal{G}_1$, then

$$T_{\mathcal{G}_1}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\le T_{\mathcal{G}_2}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}),\quad \text{for all } \mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}\in\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{G}_2}.$$

If $\mathcal{G}$ is a subgraph of the $\mathbb{Z}^d$ lattice induced by a set $B\subseteq\mathbb{R}^d$, then we define $T_\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})=T_\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{x}^*,\mathbf{y}^*)$ for any $\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}\in B$, where $\mathbf{x}^*$ and $\mathbf{y}^*$ denotes the points in $B\cap\mathbb{Z}^d$ closest to $\mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{y}$.

We will also use some additional notation. We will let $T(\cdot,\cdot)$ denote $T_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\cdot,\cdot)$ for short. For $K\ge 1$ and $\hat{\mathbf{z}}\in\mathbb{U}^{d-1}$, we will let $T_{K,\hat{\mathbf{z}}}(\cdot,\cdot)$ denote passage times on the graph induced by $\bigcup_{a\in\mathbb{R}}B(a\hat{\mathbf{z}},K)$, and referred to as the $(K,d,\hat{\mathbf{z}})$-*tube* (more on this graph in Section 2.3). For $K\ge 1$ and $\mathbf{x}$, $\mathbf{y}\in\mathbb{R}^d$, we will let $\tilde{T}_K(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})$ denote the passage time between $\mathbf{x}^*$ and $\mathbf{y}^*$ on the subgraph of the $\mathbb{Z}^d$ lattice induced by the set $\bigcup_{a\in[0,1]}B\big(\mathbf{x}^*+a(\mathbf{y}^*-\mathbf{x}^*),K\big)$. In all these cases we assume the above coupling present. In particular, for any $K\ge 1$, $\mathbf{z}\in\mathbb{Z}^d$, and with $\hat{\mathbf{z}}=\mathbf{z}/|\mathbf{z}|$,

$$T(m\mathbf{z},n\mathbf{z})\;\le\;T_{K,\hat{\mathbf{z}}}(m\mathbf{z},n\mathbf{z})\;\le\;\tilde{T}_K(m\mathbf{z},n\mathbf{z}),\quad \text{for any } m,n\in\mathbb{Z}.$$

When we consider dynamical passage times $\{\tau_e(s)\}_{e\in\mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{Z}^d}}$ in Section 5 and 6, the analogous coupling to the above one will be assumed to be in force. The notation above will be adopted also in this case, with an additional superscript (s), as in $T^{(s)}_\mathcal{G}(\cdot,\cdot)$, to indicate that dynamical passage times are considered.

2.2 Geometry of the lattice

We will in this section deduce some basic properties of the graphs we consider, such as connectivity. Furthermore, we will also describe what requirements are necessary for the entities we are interested in to have finite moments.

Lemma 2.3. *For $\mathbf{z}\in\mathbb{Z}^d$ and $r\ge\sqrt{d}$, the subgraph of the $\mathbb{Z}^d$ lattice induced by $\bigcup_{a\in[0,1]}B(a\mathbf{z},r)$ is connected.*

Proof. Let $r\ge\sqrt{d}$. Observe that for any $\mathbf{x}\in\mathbb{R}^d$, the graph induced by $B(\mathbf{x},r)$ is connected and nonempty. Moreover, $\mathbb{Z}^d\cap\bigcup_{a\in[0,c]}B(a\mathbf{z},r)$ can be written as a union of $B(a_j\mathbf{z},r)$ for finitely many j's. Since the induced graph of each $B(a_j\mathbf{z},r)$ is connected, it suffice to choose an increasing sequence of a_j's such that $B(a_j\mathbf{z},r)\cap B(a_{j+1}\mathbf{z},r)\cap\mathbb{Z}^d\ne\emptyset$, for each j. ☐

Given $\mathbf{x}\in\mathbb{R}^d$, recall that $\mathbf{x}^*$ denotes the point in $\mathbb{Z}^d$ closest to $\mathbf{x}$. Clearly $|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}^*|\le\sqrt{d}/2$.

Lemma 2.4. *There exists* $R_d < \infty$ *such that for each* $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ *and* $b, c > 0$*, there are* $2d$ *disjoint paths between* $(b\mathbf{z})^*$ *and* $(c\mathbf{z})^*$ *contained in the subgraph of the* $\mathbb{Z}^d$ *lattice induced by* $\bigcup_{a\in[b,c]} B(a\mathbf{z}, R_d)$*.*

From now on and throughout the paper, R_d will be considered as a fixed constant choosen as in Lemma 2.4.

Proof. Set $\mathbf{y} = (c\mathbf{z})^* - (b\mathbf{z})^*$. Pick $2d-1$ points $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{2d-1} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ such that the $2d$ tubes $\bigcup_{a\in[0,1]} B\big((b\mathbf{z})^* + a\mathbf{y}, \sqrt{d}\big)$, and $\bigcup_{a\in[0,1]} B\big(\mathbf{x}_j + a\mathbf{y}, \sqrt{d}\big)$ for $j = 1, 2, \dots, 2d-1$ are pairwise disjoint. Since each tube is connected, by Lemma 2.3, we obtain $2d$ paths from $(b\mathbf{z})^*$ to $(c\mathbf{z})^*$ by connecting $(b\mathbf{z})^*$ and $(c\mathbf{z})^*$ by disjoint paths to $\mathbf{x}_j$ and $\mathbf{y} + \mathbf{x}_j$, respectively. If the points $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{2d-1}$ are chosen at distance at most M from $(b\mathbf{z})^*$, then the $2d$ paths will be included in $\bigcup_{a\in[0,1]} B\big((b\mathbf{z})^* + a\mathbf{y}, M + \sqrt{d}\big)$. Thus, it suffices to choose $R_d \geq M + 3\sqrt{d}/2$. ☐

We now turn to questions regarding conditions for existence of finite moments. For any $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$, we have $\mathrm{P}\big(T(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{z}) > s\big) \geq \mathrm{P}(Y > s)$. It is therefore immediate that for any $\alpha > 0$

$$\mathrm{E}[Y^\alpha] = \infty \quad \Rightarrow \quad \mathrm{E}\left[T(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{z})^\alpha\right] = \infty.$$

The converse is also true.

Proposition 2.5. *Let* $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$*,* $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}$*,* $\alpha > 0$*, and set* $\hat{\mathbf{z}} = \mathbf{z}/|\mathbf{z}|$*. When* $\mathrm{E}[Y^\alpha] < \infty$*, then*

$$\mathrm{E}\left[T(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{z})^\alpha\right] < \infty, \quad \mathrm{E}\left[T_{K,\hat{\mathbf{z}}}(m\hat{\mathbf{z}}, n\hat{\mathbf{z}})^\alpha\right] < \infty, \quad \textit{and} \quad \mathrm{E}\left[\tilde{T}_K(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{z})^\alpha\right] < \infty, \quad \textit{for } K \geq R_d.$$

Proof. One may easily realize, e.g. via induction, that there are $2d$ disjoint paths between $\mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{z}$ of length at most $\|\mathbf{z}\|_1 + 8$. Let Γ denote the longest of the $2d$ disjoint paths between $\mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{z}$, and let λ denote its length. Then

$$\mathrm{P}\big(T(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{z}) > s\big) \;\leq\; \mathrm{P}\big(T(\Gamma) > s\big)^{2d} \;\leq\; \lambda^{2d}\mathrm{P}(\tau_e > s/\lambda)^{2d} \;=\; \lambda^{2d}\mathrm{P}(Y > s/\lambda), \tag{2.4}$$

where the second inequality holds because if $T(\Gamma) > s$, then for at least one of the λ edges $\tau_e > s/\lambda$. Moreover, for any non-negative random variable X, then $\mathrm{E}[X^\alpha] = \alpha\int_0^\infty x^{\alpha-1}\mathrm{P}(X > x)\, dx$ for $\alpha > 0$. In particular,

$$\mathrm{E}[X^\alpha] < \infty \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^{\alpha-1}\mathrm{P}(X \geq n) < \infty, \tag{2.5}$$

We conclude that $\mathrm{E}[Y^\alpha] < \infty$ implies $\mathrm{E}\left[T(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{z})^\alpha\right] < \infty$. In combination with Lemma 2.4, the other conclusions follow in a similar manner. ☐

Theorem 1.2 and 1.6 will be proven under the assumption that $\mathrm{E}[\tau_e^2] < \infty$. That assumption simplifies the presentation somewhat, since Chebychev's inequality applies. The same inequality can be applied to find that indeed

$$\mathrm{E}[\tau_e^2] < \infty \quad \Rightarrow \quad \mathrm{E}[Y^{4d}] < \infty. \tag{2.6}$$

2.3 Tube convergence

In this section we shall review some results from Ahlberg (2010) that will be needed in the present paper. In that paper, the key to understand the behaviour of first-passage times on essentially 1-dimensional periodic graphs was to identify a regenerative structure. In this paper, we will have a particular interest in the graph induced by the set $\bigcup_{a\in\mathbb{R}} B(a\hat{\mathbf{z}}, K)$, above referred to as the $(K, d, \hat{\mathbf{z}})$-tube. Its regenerative structure is specified in the following result.

Proposition 2.6. *Assume that* $K \geq R_d$, $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ *and* $\hat{\mathbf{z}} = \mathbf{z}/|\mathbf{z}|$. *There is a sequence of non-negative integer-valued random variables* $\{\rho_j\}_{j\geq 0}$ *such that*

a) $T_{K,\hat{\mathbf{z}}}(\mathbf{0}, \rho_j\mathbf{z}) - T_{K,\hat{\mathbf{z}}}(\mathbf{0}, \rho_{j-1}\mathbf{z}) = T_{K,\hat{\mathbf{z}}}(\rho_{j-1}\mathbf{z}, \rho_j\mathbf{z})$.

b) $\Big\{\big(T_{K,\hat{\mathbf{z}}}(\rho_{j-1}\mathbf{z}, \rho_j\mathbf{z}), \rho_j - \rho_{j-1}\big)\Big\}_{j\geq 1}$ *forms a sequence of i.i.d. random elements.*

The behaviour specified in the above proposition is referred to as a *regenerative behaviour.* In particular, $T_{K,\hat{\mathbf{z}}}(\mathbf{0}, \rho_n\mathbf{z})$ can be written as a sum of independent variables

$$T_{K,\hat{\mathbf{z}}}(\mathbf{0}, \rho_n\mathbf{z}) = T_{K,\hat{\mathbf{z}}}(\mathbf{0}, \rho_0\mathbf{z}) + \sum_{j=1}^{n} T_{K,\hat{\mathbf{z}}}(\rho_{j-1}\mathbf{z}, \rho_j\mathbf{z}).$$

This can be exploited in order to approximate the value of $T_{K,\hat{\mathbf{z}}}(\mathbf{0}, n\mathbf{z})$. Indeed, $T_{K,\hat{\mathbf{z}}}(\mathbf{0}, n\mathbf{z})$ can be approximated by $T_{K,\hat{\mathbf{z}}}(\mathbf{0}, \rho_{\nu(n)}\mathbf{z})$, where

$$\nu(n) := \min\{j \in \mathbb{N} : \rho_j \geq n\}.$$

Since $\{\rho_j\}_{j\geq 0}$ is an increasing sequence, we must have that $\nu(n) \leq n$. Define further

$$\mu_K(\hat{\mathbf{z}}) := \frac{\mathrm{E}\left[T_{K,\hat{\mathbf{z}}}(\rho_{j-1}\mathbf{z}, \rho_j\mathbf{z})\right]}{|\mathbf{z}|\,\mathrm{E}[\rho_j - \rho_{j-1}]}, \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta_j := T_{K,\hat{\mathbf{z}}}(\rho_{j-1}\mathbf{z}, \rho_j\mathbf{z}) - |\mathbf{z}|\mu_K(\hat{\mathbf{z}})(\rho_j - \rho_{j-1}).$$

Proposition 2.7. *The sequence* $\{\rho_j\}_{j\geq 0}$ *can be chosen such that the distributions of* $\rho_{\nu(n)} - n$ *and* $T_{K,\hat{\mathbf{z}}}(n\mathbf{z}, \rho_{\nu(n)}\mathbf{z})$ *does not depend on* n, *and such that for any* $\alpha \geq 1$ *and* $j \geq 1$,

a) $\mathrm{E}\left[(\rho_j - \rho_{j-1})^\alpha\right] < \infty$ *and* $\mathrm{E}\left[(\rho_{\nu(n)} - n)^\alpha\right] < \infty$.

b) if $\mathrm{E}[Y^\alpha] < \infty$, *then*

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathrm{E}\left[T_{K,\hat{\mathbf{z}}}(\rho_{j-1}\mathbf{z}, \rho_j\mathbf{z})^\alpha\right] < \infty, && \mathrm{E}\left[T_{K,\hat{\mathbf{z}}}(n\mathbf{z}, \rho_{\nu(n)}\mathbf{z})^\alpha\right] < \infty, \\ &\mathrm{E}\left[|\Delta_j|^\alpha\right] < \infty, && \mathrm{E}\Big[\big|T_{K,\hat{\mathbf{z}}}(\mathbf{0}, \rho_0\mathbf{z}) - |\mathbf{z}|\rho_0\mu_K(\hat{\mathbf{z}})\big|^\alpha\Big] < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, if $\mathrm{E}[Y] < \infty$, *then* $\mathrm{E}[\Delta_j] = 0$ *for all* $j \geq 1$.

The regenerative behaviour described in Proposition 2.6 and 2.7 was deduced in Ahlberg (2010) and used to prove the following limiting behaviour.

Proposition 2.8. *Let $K \geq R_d$ and $\hat{\mathbf{z}} \in \mathbb{U}^{d-1}$. If* $\mathrm{E}[Y] < \infty$*, then*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{T_{K,\hat{\mathbf{z}}}(\mathbf{0}, n\hat{\mathbf{z}})}{n} = \mu_K(\hat{\mathbf{z}}), \quad \textit{almost surely and in } L^1.$$

The same conclusion holds for $T_{K,\hat{\mathbf{z}}}(\mathbf{0}, n\hat{\mathbf{z}})$ exchanged for $\tilde{T}_K(\mathbf{0}, n\hat{\mathbf{z}})$.

The above theorem was proved for so called essentially 1-dimensional periodic graphs. The $(K, d, \hat{\mathbf{z}})$-tube is an example of such a graph. The statement regarding $\tilde{T}_K(\mathbf{0}, n\hat{\mathbf{z}})$, was in Ahlberg (2010) not directly stated. However, it is easily seen to follow analogously. Proposition 2.8 could in fact be derived from the Subadditive Ergodic Theorem. However, the approach using regenerative sequences allows for much more detailed picture to be derived. A central limit theorem and a law of the iterated logarithm are two examples of additional results obtained in Ahlberg (2010).

There it was also seen that $\mu_K(\hat{\mathbf{z}}) > \mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{z}})$ for all K. However, as K increases the constants approach eachother. This fairly simple consequence the subadditive behaviour will be essential in this paper. It was indicated already in Chayes and Chayes (1984), and proofs appeared in Ahlberg (2008, 2010); Chatterjee and Dey (2009). Due to its central rôle to this paper, we recall the proof also here.

Proposition 2.9. $\lim_{K\to\infty} \mu_K(\hat{\mathbf{z}}) = \mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{z}}),$ *for all $\hat{\mathbf{z}} \in \mathbb{U}^{d-1}$.*

Proof. Clearly $\tilde{T}_K(\mathbf{0}, n\hat{\mathbf{z}})$ is decreasing in K. For all n we get

$$T(\mathbf{0}, n\hat{\mathbf{z}}) = \lim_{K\to\infty} \tilde{T}_K(\mathbf{0}, n\hat{\mathbf{z}}) = \inf_{K\geq 0} \tilde{T}_K(\mathbf{0}, n\hat{\mathbf{z}}), \quad \text{almost surely.}$$

An application of the Monotone Convergence Theorem gives

$$\mathrm{E}\left[T(\mathbf{0}, n\hat{\mathbf{z}})\right] = \lim_{K\to\infty} \mathrm{E}\left[\tilde{T}_K(\mathbf{0}, n\hat{\mathbf{z}})\right] = \inf_{K\geq 0} \mathrm{E}\left[\tilde{T}_K(\mathbf{0}, n\hat{\mathbf{z}})\right].$$

By Fekete's lemma $\exists \lim_{n\to\infty} a_n/n = \inf_{n\geq 1} a_n/n$, for any subadditive real-valued sequence $\{a_n\}_{n\geq 1}$. Hence, for any $0 \leq K \leq \infty$

$$\mu_K(\hat{\mathbf{z}}) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\mathrm{E}\left[\tilde{T}_K(\mathbf{0}, n\hat{\mathbf{z}})\right]}{n} = \inf_{n\geq 1} \frac{\mathrm{E}\left[\tilde{T}_K(\mathbf{0}, n\hat{\mathbf{z}})\right]}{n}.$$

(Here $\mu_\infty(\hat{\mathbf{z}})$ refers to $\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{z}})$, and $\tilde{T}_\infty(\mathbf{0}, n\hat{\mathbf{z}})$ to $T(\mathbf{0}, n\hat{\mathbf{z}})$.) Thus, since μ_K is non-increasing in K we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{K\to\infty} \mu_K(\hat{\mathbf{z}}) &= \inf_{K\geq 0} \inf_{n\geq 1} \frac{\mathrm{E}\left[\tilde{T}_K(\mathbf{0}, n\hat{\mathbf{z}})\right]}{n} = \inf_{n\geq 1} \inf_{K\geq 0} \frac{\mathrm{E}\left[\tilde{T}_K(\mathbf{0}, n\hat{\mathbf{z}})\right]}{n} \\ &= \inf_{n\geq 1} \frac{\mathrm{E}\left[T(\mathbf{0}, n\hat{\mathbf{z}})\right]}{n} = \mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{z}}). \end{aligned}$$

□

3 Large deviation estimates for the lattice

The aim of this section is to prove Proposition 1.3, 1.4 and 1.5. The proof of the first of the three will be based on a characterization of the rate of convergence of large deviations of i.i.d. sums. The characterization is a generalized version of a result due to Hsu, Robbins and Erdős. We refer the reader to Gut (2005, Theorem 12.1) for a more complete statement as well as a proof.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $X_1, X_2, \ldots$ be i.i.d. random variables with mean μ, and let $S_n = \sum_{k=1}^{n} X_k$. For $\alpha \geq 1$, the following are equivalent.*

a) $\mathrm{E}\big[|X_k|^\alpha\big] < \infty$.

b) $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^{\alpha-2}\mathrm{P}\big(|S_n - \mu n| > n\epsilon\big) < \infty$, *for all* $\epsilon > 0$.

c) $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^{\alpha-2}\mathrm{P}\big(\max_{1\leq k\leq n} |S_k - \mu k| > n\epsilon\big) < \infty$, *for all* $\epsilon > 0$.

The proof of Proposition 1.5 will be an adaptation of a proof given in Kesten (1986) of a less general statement. Proposition 1.5 will be derived under the additional assumption that $\mathrm{E}[Y^d] < \infty$, and the reader is referred to Kesten's paper to see how this assumption can be avoided. The details of how Proposition 1.4 follows from Proposition 1.5 are easy to sort out, and therefore left to the reader. A proof of (1.5) will also be presented.

3.1 Above the time constant

In order to derive the large deviation estimate for the $\mathbb{Z}^d$ lattice, we will first do so for tubes. The following result was not included in Ahlberg (2010), but will be proved by similar means, based on Proposition 2.6 and 2.7.

Proposition 3.2. *Let $K \geq R_d$, $\hat{\mathbf{z}} \in \mathbb{U}^{d-1}$ and $\alpha \geq 1$. If $\mathrm{E}[Y^\alpha] < \infty$, then*

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^{\alpha-2}\mathrm{P}\Big(\big|T_{K,\hat{\mathbf{z}}}(\mathbf{0}, n\hat{\mathbf{z}}) - n\mu_K(\hat{\mathbf{z}})\big| > n\epsilon\Big) < \infty, \quad \textit{for any } \epsilon > 0.$$

Proof. Fix $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ such that $\hat{\mathbf{z}} = \mathbf{z}/|\mathbf{z}|$. Let $m_n := \min\{m \in \mathbb{N} : |\mathbf{z}|m \geq n\}$. Clearly $0 \leq |\mathbf{z}|m_n - n < |\mathbf{z}|$. Due to subadditivity,

$$\begin{aligned}\Big|T_{K,\hat{\mathbf{z}}}(\mathbf{0}, n\hat{\mathbf{z}}) - n\mu_K(\hat{\mathbf{z}})\Big| \;&\leq\; T_{K,\hat{\mathbf{z}}}(n\hat{\mathbf{z}}, m_n\mathbf{z}) + T_{K,\hat{\mathbf{z}}}(m_n\mathbf{z}, \rho_{\nu(m_n)}\mathbf{z}) \\ &+\; \Big|T_{K,\hat{\mathbf{z}}}(\mathbf{0}, \rho_{\nu(m_n)}\mathbf{z}) - |\mathbf{z}|\rho_{\nu(m_n)}\mu_K(\hat{\mathbf{z}})\Big| \\ &+\; |\mathbf{z}|\mu_K(\hat{\mathbf{z}})\Big|\rho_{\nu(m_n)} - m_n\Big| + \mu_K(\hat{\mathbf{z}})\Big||\mathbf{z}|m_n - n\Big|.\end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

If we denote the terms in the right-hand side of (3.1) by $X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_5$, then it suffices to show that for each $j = 1, 2, \ldots, 5$

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^{\alpha-2}\mathrm{P}(X_j > n\epsilon/5) < \infty. \tag{3.2}$$

The last term in the right-hand side of (3.1) is nonrandom and bounded. Thus $\mathrm{P}(X_5 > \epsilon n/5) = 0$ for large n. Thus, (3.2) does hold for $j = 5$. According to Proposition 2.7, $\rho_{\nu(m_n)} - m_n$ has finite moment of any order, and its distribution does not depend on n. Thus, (2.5) implies that (3.2) holds also for $j = 4$.

The only term that is essentially contributing is that for $j = 3$. Since $\nu(m) \leq m$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{P}(X_3 > \epsilon n/5) &\leq \mathrm{P}\left(\max_{i \leq m_n} \left| T_{K,\hat{\mathbf{z}}}(\mathbf{0}, \rho_i \mathbf{z}) - |\mathbf{z}|\rho_i \mu_K(\hat{\mathbf{z}}) \right| > n\epsilon/5\right) \\
&\leq \mathrm{P}\left(\left| T_{K,\hat{\mathbf{z}}}(\mathbf{0}, \rho_0 \mathbf{z}) - |\mathbf{z}|\rho_0 \mu_K(\hat{\mathbf{z}}) \right| + \max_{i \leq m_n} \left| \sum_{j=1}^{i} \Delta_j \right| > n\epsilon/5 \right) \\
&\leq \mathrm{P}\Big(\left| T_{K,\hat{\mathbf{z}}}(\mathbf{0}, \rho_0 \mathbf{z}) - |\mathbf{z}|\rho_0 \mu_K(\hat{\mathbf{z}}) \right| > n\epsilon/10 \Big) + \mathrm{P}\left(\max_{i \leq m_n} \left| \sum_{j=1}^{i} \Delta_j \right| > n\epsilon/10 \right).
\end{aligned}$$

According to Proposition 2.6 and 2.7 the sequence $\{\Delta_j\}_{j \geq 1}$ is i.i.d., and both $T_{K,\hat{\mathbf{z}}}(\mathbf{0}, \rho_0 \mathbf{z}) - |\mathbf{z}|\rho_0 \mu_K(\hat{\mathbf{z}})$ and Δ_j (for $j \geq 1$) have finite moments of order α. Thus, via (2.5) and Theorem 3.1 (respectively) we conclude that (3.2) holds for $j = 3$.

That (3.2) holds for $j = 2$ and $j = 1$ will follow in a similar way from (2.5) as for $j = 4$. Again, Proposition 2.7 gives that the distribution of $X_2 = T_{K,\hat{\mathbf{z}}}(m\mathbf{z}, \rho_{\nu(m)}\mathbf{z})$ does not depend on m, and has finite moment of order α. Finally, the distribution of $X_1 = T_{K,\hat{\mathbf{z}}}(n\hat{\mathbf{z}}, m_n \mathbf{z})$ may depend on n. However, it can only vary among a finite number of different ones, each with finite moment of order α (there are $2d$ disjoint paths between $n\hat{\mathbf{z}}$ and $m_n\mathbf{z}$, due to Lemma 2.4). ☐

We will derive Proposition 1.3 from the estimate on the deviations from the time constant on tubes, that we have just proved.

Proof of Proposition 1.3. Let $\epsilon > 0$, $\alpha \geq 1$ and assume that $\mathrm{E}[Y^\alpha] < \infty$. We will first prove that for any $\hat{\mathbf{z}} \in \mathbb{U}^{d-1}$

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^{\alpha-2} \mathrm{P}\Big(T(\mathbf{0}, n\hat{\mathbf{z}}) > \big(\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{z}}) + \epsilon\big) n \Big) < \infty.$$

Take K large enough for $\mu_K(\hat{\mathbf{z}}) \leq \mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{z}}) + \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ (which is possible according to Proposition 2.9). Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^{\alpha-2} \mathrm{P}\Big(T(\mathbf{0}, n\hat{\mathbf{z}}) > \big(\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{z}}) + \epsilon\big) n \Big) &\leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^{\alpha-2} \mathrm{P}\Big(T(\mathbf{0}, n\hat{\mathbf{z}}) > \big(\mu_K(\hat{\mathbf{z}}) + \epsilon/2\big) n \Big) \\
&\leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^{\alpha-2} \mathrm{P}\Big(T_{K,\hat{\mathbf{z}}}(\mathbf{0}, n\hat{\mathbf{z}}) > \big(\mu_K(\hat{\mathbf{z}}) + \epsilon/2\big) n \Big),
\end{aligned}$$

which Proposition 3.2 says is finite when $\mathrm{E}[Y^\alpha] < \infty$.

We proceed with the general case. For $\hat{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$, take $\hat{\mathbf{z}} \in \mathbb{U}^{d-1}$ such that $|\hat{\mathbf{x}} - \hat{\mathbf{z}}| \leq \epsilon$. Now

$$T(\mathbf{0}, n\hat{\mathbf{x}}) - n\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) \;\leq\; \Big(T(\mathbf{0}, n\hat{\mathbf{z}}) - n\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{z}}) \Big) \;+\; T(n\hat{\mathbf{z}}, n\hat{\mathbf{x}}) \;+\; n\Big(\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{z}}) - \mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) \Big)$$

According to 2.3 we have $n\big|\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{z}}) - \mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{x}})\big| \le d\,\mathrm{E}\left[T(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{e}_1)\right]n\epsilon$. We will show that for some $M < \infty$

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^{\alpha-2}\mathrm{P}\Big(T(n\hat{\mathbf{z}}, n\hat{\mathbf{x}}) > Mn\epsilon\Big) < \infty. \tag{3.3}$$

All of the above then easily gives that

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^{\alpha-2}\mathrm{P}\Big(T(\mathbf{0}, n\hat{\mathbf{x}}) - n\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) > \big(1 + M + d\,\mathrm{E}\left[T(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{e}_1)\right]\big)n\epsilon\Big) < \infty,$$

which is sufficient since $\epsilon > 0$ was arbitrary. It remains to prove (3.3).

Choose a path between $(n\hat{\mathbf{z}})^*$ and $(n\hat{\mathbf{x}})^*$ of length $\lambda_n := \big\|(n\hat{\mathbf{x}})^* - (n\hat{\mathbf{z}})^*\big\|_1$. Let $v_0, v_1, \ldots, v_{\lambda_n}$ denote the sequence of vertices in the path. Subadditivity gives that

$$T(n\hat{\mathbf{z}}, n\hat{\mathbf{x}}) \;\le\; \sum_{j=1}^{\lambda_n} T(v_{j-1}, v_j) \;\le\; \sum_{j=1}^{\lambda_n} \hat{T}(v_{j-1}, v_j),$$

where $\hat{T}(v_{j-1}, v_j) = \min\big(T(\Gamma_1), T(\Gamma_2), \ldots, T(\Gamma_{2d})\big)$, and $\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2, \ldots, \Gamma_{2d}$ denotes the $2d$ disjoint paths between v_{j-1} and v_j of length at most 9. The variables $\hat{T}(v_{j-1}, v_j)$ and $\hat{T}(v_{i-1}, v_i)$ are not necessarily independent for $i \neq j$. However, they are if $|v_j - v_i| > 4\sqrt{2}$. Since $|j - i| = \|v_j - v_i\|_1 \le d|v_j - v_i|$, they will be independent when $|j - i| > 4d\sqrt{2}$. We can therefore partition $\{0, 1, \ldots, \lambda_n\}$ into at most $8d\sqrt{2} + 1 \le 13d$ sets $J_1, J_2, \ldots, J_{13d}$, such that for each $i = 1, 2, \ldots, 13d$, the elements in $\big\{\hat{T}(v_{j-1}, v_j)\big\}_{j \in J_i}$ are independent. Each J_i contains at most $\lambda_n \le d(\sqrt{d} + n\epsilon)$, which for large n is at most $2dn\epsilon$, indices. Thus, since when $\mathrm{E}[Y^\alpha] < \infty$ also $\mathrm{E}\left[\hat{T}(v_{j-1}, v_j)^\alpha\right] < \infty$, Theorem 3.1 assures that

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^{\alpha-2}\mathrm{P}\left(\sum_{j \in J_i} \hat{T}(v_{j-1}, v_j) > \Big(\mathrm{E}\left[\hat{T}(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{e}_1)\right] + 1\Big)2dn\epsilon\right) < \infty.$$

We conclude that

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^{\alpha-2}\mathrm{P}\left(T(n\hat{\mathbf{z}}, n\hat{\mathbf{x}}) > 26d\Big(\mathrm{E}\left[\hat{T}(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{e}_1)\right] + 1\Big)dn\epsilon\right) < \infty.$$

This proves (3.3). □

In preparation for Section 4, we also prove that radial L^1-convergence holds in any direction on the $\mathbb{Z}^d$ lattice. The proof of which is similar to the proof of Proposition 1.3.

Proposition 3.3. *Let* $\hat{\mathrm{x}} \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ *and* $d \ge 2$. *If* $\mathrm{E}[Y] < \infty$, *then*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathrm{E}\left|\frac{T(\mathbf{0}, n\hat{\mathbf{x}})}{n} - \mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{x}})\right| = 0.$$

Proof. Let $\epsilon > 0$ and take $\hat{\mathbf{z}} \in \mathbb{U}^{d-1}$ such that $|\hat{\mathbf{x}} - \hat{\mathbf{z}}| \le \epsilon$. As in the proof of Proposition 1.3 we have

$$\begin{aligned}\big|T(\mathbf{0}, n\hat{\mathbf{x}}) - n\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{x}})\big| &\le \big|T(\mathbf{0}, n\hat{\mathbf{z}}) - n\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{z}})\big| + T(n\hat{\mathbf{z}}, n\hat{\mathbf{x}}) \ + \ n\big|\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) - \mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{z}})\big| \\ &\le \big|T(\mathbf{0}, n\hat{\mathbf{z}}) - n\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{z}})\big| \ + \ \sum_{j=1}^{\lambda_n} \hat{T}(v_{j-1}, v_j) \ + \ d\,\mathrm{E}\big[T(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{e}_1)\big] n\epsilon,\end{aligned}$$

where $\lambda_n = \big\|(n\hat{\mathbf{x}})^* - (n\hat{\mathbf{z}})^*\big\|_1 \le d\big(\sqrt{d} + n|\hat{\mathbf{x}} - \hat{\mathbf{z}}|\big)$. Together with (1.2), we obtain that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathrm{E}\left|\frac{T(\mathbf{0}, n\hat{\mathbf{x}})}{n} - \mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{x}})\right| \ \le \ d\Big(\mathrm{E}\big[\hat{T}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{e}_1)\big] \ + \ \mathrm{E}\big[T(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{e}_1)\big]\Big)\epsilon.$$

Since, $\mathrm{E}\big[\hat{T}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{e}_1)\big] < \infty$ when $\mathrm{E}[Y] < \infty$, and $\epsilon > 0$ arbitrary, the L^1-convergence follows. $\square$

3.2 Below the time constant

We first present a proof of (1.5). We will prove (1.5) and Proposition 1.5 under the additional assumption that $\mathrm{E}[Y^d] < \infty$. With this assumption, the derivation of (1.5) and Lemma 3.5 below can be simplified somewhat, since it enables us to appeal to the Shape Theorem directly. An alternative version of the Shape Theorem (see Kesten (1986)) can be used to obtain our results without moment assumption. The reader can in Kesten's paper find the additional details that are needed in that case.

Proof of (1.5). Assume that $\mathrm{E}[Y^d] < \infty$. By definition, we easily obtain that, almost surely,

$$\frac{T^{\mathcal{W}}_{0,n}}{n} \le \frac{T\Big(\mathbf{0}, \Big(\frac{n}{\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\mathbf{e}_1)} + 1\Big)\mathbf{e}_1\Big)}{n} = \frac{\frac{n}{\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\mathbf{e}_1)} + 1}{n} \cdot \frac{T\Big(\mathbf{0}, \Big(\frac{n}{\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\mathbf{e}_1)} + 1\Big)\mathbf{e}_1\Big)}{\frac{n}{\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\mathbf{e}_1)} + 1} \ \to \ 1, \quad \text{as } n \to \infty.$$

So, it suffice to show that

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{T^{\mathcal{W}}_{0,n}}{n} \ \ge \ 1, \quad \text{almost surely.} \tag{3.4}$$

Assume that there is $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{T^{\mathcal{W}}_{0,n}}{n} \ \le \ 1 - \delta \tag{3.5}$$

has positive probability. For any realization satisfying (3.5) there are $n_1 < n_2 < \ldots$ such that $T^{\mathcal{W}}_{0,n_k}/n_k \le 1 - \delta/2$. In particular, we can pick $\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2, \ldots$ such that $\mathbf{z}_k \in \mathcal{W}_{n_k(1-\delta/2)}$ and

$$|\mathbf{z}_k| \ \ge \ \frac{n_k}{\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\mathbf{z}_k/|\mathbf{z}_k|)},$$

for each $k = 1, 2, \ldots$. The Shape Theorem says that with probability one

$$\mathcal{W}_{n(1-\delta/2)} \subseteq n(1 - \delta/4)\mathcal{W}^*, \tag{3.6}$$

for any n sufficiently large. Thus, there are realizations satisfying both (3.5) and (3.6). But, (3.6) implies that for all n sufficiently large, if $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{W}_{n(1-\delta/2)}$, then

$$|\mathbf{z}| \leq \frac{n(1-\delta/4)}{\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\mathbf{z}/|\mathbf{z}|)},$$

which is a contradiction. Hence, (3.4) must hold. □

We now prepare for the proof of Proposition 1.5. That will require to extend the definition of point-to-shape passage times somewhat. Assume that $\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\mathbf{e}_1) > 0$. For any $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, let $u(\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x}) = (\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x})/|\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x}|$. Define for any $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ and integers $0 \leq n \leq m$

$$T^{\mathcal{W}}_{n,m}(\mathbf{z}) := \inf\left\{ T(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) : |\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{z}| \leq \frac{n}{\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\big(u(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{z})\big)} \text{ and } |\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{z}| \geq \frac{m}{\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\big(u(\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{z})\big)} \right\}.$$

For short, we write $T^{\mathcal{W}}_{n,m} = T^{\mathcal{W}}_{n,m}(\mathbf{0})$. One should think of $T^{\mathcal{W}}_{n,m}$ as the minimal travel time from some vertex within $n\mathcal{W}^*$ to some vertex at the boundary, or in the complement, of $m\mathcal{W}^*$. Following Kesten's approach, the first step in proving Proposition 1.5 is this next lemma.

Lemma 3.4. *Let $X^{(q)}_{N,N+M}$ for $q = 1, 2, \ldots$ denote independent random variables distributed as $T^{\mathcal{W}}_{N,N+M}$. There exists $C < \infty$ such that for any $n \geq M \geq N \geq 0$ and $x > 0$ we have*

$$\mathrm{P}\big(T^{\mathcal{W}}_{0,n} < x\big) \;\leq\; \sum_{Q+1 \geq n/(M+CN)} n^{d-1}\left(C\frac{M}{N}\right)^{d(Q-1)} \mathrm{P}\left(\sum_{q=1}^{Q} X^{(q)}_{N,N+M} < x\right).$$

The proof of this lemma does not require any moment assumption.

Proof. Pick $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ such that $|\mathbf{z}| \geq n/\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{z}})$, where $\hat{\mathbf{z}} = \mathbf{z}/|\mathbf{z}|$. Let $\gamma = \gamma(\mathbf{z})$ be a self-avoiding path from $\mathbf{0}$ to $\mathbf{z}$. Choose a subsequence $v_0, v_1, \ldots, v_Q$ of the vertices in γ as follows. Set $v_0 = \mathbf{0}$. Given v_q, choose v_{q+1} to be the first vertex in γ succeeding v_q such that

$$|v_{q+1} - v_q| \geq \frac{M+2N}{\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\big(u(v_{q+1}-v_q)\big)}.$$

When no such vertex exists, stop and set $Q = q$. To find a lower bound on Q, pick a plane tangent to $a\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{z}})\mathcal{W}^*$ at the point $a\hat{\mathbf{z}}$ and denote it by $H(a,\hat{\mathbf{z}})$. That at least one such plane exists follows from convexity of $\mathcal{W}^*$. Take $a_q \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $v_q \in H(a_q, \hat{\mathbf{z}})$ for each $q = 0, 1, \ldots, Q$. It is easily seen that $a_q \leq q\left(\frac{M+2N}{\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{z}})} + 1\right)$. Moreover, $\mathbf{z} \in H(a, \hat{\mathbf{z}})$ for some a satisfying

$$n/\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{z}}) \;\leq\; a \;\leq\; a_Q + \frac{M+2N}{\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{z}})} \;\leq\; (Q+1)\left(\frac{M+2N}{\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{z}})} + 1\right).$$

In particular, since $\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{z}}) \leq \sqrt{d}\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\mathbf{e}_1)$, we see that Q must satisfy

$$n \;\leq\; (Q+1)\Big(M + \big(2 + \sqrt{d}\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\mathbf{e}_1)\big)N\Big). \tag{3.7}$$

Next, pick $r > 0$ such that $[-r,r]^d \subseteq \mathcal{W}^*$ and tile $\mathbb{Z}^d$ with copies of $(-rN,rN]^d$ such that each box is centered at a point in $\mathbb{Z}^d$, and each point in $\mathbb{Z}^d$ is contained in precisely one box. Let Λ_q denote the box that contains v_q, and let w_q denote the center of Λ_q. Of course, the tiling can be chosen such that $w_0 = v_0 = \mathbf{0}$. Denote by γ_q the part of the path γ that connects v_q and v_{q+1}. Note that for $q_1 \neq q_2$ the two pieces γ_{q_1} and γ_{q_2} are edge disjoint. By construction v_q is included in the copy of $N\mathcal{W}^*$ centered at w_q. Moreover, v_{q+1} is not included in the interior of the copy of $(M+2N)\mathcal{W}^*$ centered at v_q. By convexity of $\mathcal{W}^*$, v_{q+1} cannot either lie in the interior of the shape $(M+N)\mathcal{W}^*$ centered at w_q. That is,

$$|v_q - w_q| \;\leq\; \frac{N}{\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\big(u(v_q - w_q)\big)} \quad \text{and} \quad |v_{q+1} - w_q| \;\geq\; \frac{M+N}{\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\big(u(v_{q+1} - w_q)\big)}. \tag{3.8}$$

Given $x > 0$, $Q \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and $w_1, \ldots, w_{Q-1}$, let $A(x, w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_{Q-1})$ denote the event that there exists a path γ from $\mathbf{0}$ to $\mathbf{z}$ which contains edge disjoint pieces $\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_{Q-1}$ such that

a) $\sum_{q=0}^{Q-1} T(\gamma_q) < x$,

b) for each $q = 0, 1, \ldots, Q-1$, the endpoints v_q and v_{q+1} of γ_q satisfy (3.8) (where $w_0 = \mathbf{0}$).

Since $T(\gamma) \geq \sum_{q=0}^{Q-1} T(\gamma_q)$, together with (3.7), we obtain that

$$\big\{T(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{z}) < x\big\} \;\subseteq\; \bigcup_{Q+1 \geq n/(M+bN)} \; \bigcup_{w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_{Q-1}} A(x, w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_{Q-1}) \tag{3.9}$$

where $b = 2 + \sqrt{d}\,\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\mathbf{e}_1)$. Note that given w_q, the passage time of any path between vertices $\mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{y}$ such that $|\mathbf{x} - w_q| \leq \frac{N}{\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(u(\mathbf{x}-w_q))}$ and $|\mathbf{y} - w_q| \geq \frac{M+N}{\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(u(\mathbf{y}-w_q))}$ is stochastically larger than $T^{\mathcal{W}}_{N,N+M}$. Hence, for fixed $w_0, w_1, \ldots, w_{Q-1}$, the event $A(x, w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_{Q-1})$ has probability at most

$$\mathrm{P}\Big(X^{(1)}_{N,N+M} + X^{(2)}_{N,N+M} + \ldots + X^{(Q)}_{N,N+M} < x\Big). \tag{3.10}$$

It remains to countthe number of possible choices for $w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_{Q-1}$. Assume that w_q has already been chosen. The distance which the vertex v_{q+1} can have to w_q is bounded by

$$|v_{q+1} - w_q| \;\leq\; |v_{q+1} - v_q| + |v_q - w_q| \;\leq\; \frac{M+2N}{\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\big(u(v_{q+1} - v_q)\big)} + 1 + \frac{N}{\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}\big(u(v_q - w_q)\big)}.$$

In particular, v_{q+1} is contained in the cube centered at w_q of side length

$$2\sqrt{d}\frac{M + \big(3 + \mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\mathbf{e}_1)\big)N}{\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\mathbf{e}_1)}.$$

This cube is intersected by at most $(CM/N)^d$ boxes of the form $(-rN, rN]^d$ that tiles $\mathbb{Z}^d$, for some $C < \infty$. This bounds the number of choices for w_{q+1}, and since for each $q = 1, 2, \ldots, Q-1$ we cannot have more choices than this, the total number of choices for $w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_{Q-1}$ is at most $(CM/N)^{d(Q-1)}$. From (3.9) and (3.10) we conclude that

$$\mathrm{P}\big(T(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{z}) < x\big) \;\leq\; \sum_{Q+1 \geq n/(M+CN)} \left(C\frac{M}{N}\right)^{d(Q-1)} \mathrm{P}\left(\sum_{q=1}^{Q} X^{(q)}_{N,N+M} < x\right),$$

for some $C < \infty$. The lemma now follows observing that, by convexity of $\mathcal{W}^*$, the number of $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ that satisfies $|\mathbf{z}| \geq n/\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{z}})$ and has a neighbour within $n\mathcal{W}^*$ are of order n^{d-1}. $\square$

Lemma 3.5. *For any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $\eta = \eta(\epsilon) > 0$ such that*

$$\lim_{M\to\infty} \max_{N \leq \eta M} \mathrm{P}\Big(T^{\mathcal{W}}_{N,N+M} < M(1-\epsilon)\Big) = 0.$$

Proof. We will prove this lemma under the additional, but not necessary, assumption that $\mathrm{E}[Y^d] < \infty$. For $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ with $|\mathbf{z}| \leq N/\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{z}})$, let γ be a path from $\mathbf{z}$ to some point $\mathbf{y}$ with $|\mathbf{y}| \geq (N+M)/\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\mathbf{y}/|\mathbf{y}|)$. Clearly

$$T^{\mathcal{W}}_{0,N+M} \;\leq\; T(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{z}) + T(\gamma).$$

In particular, we may pick $\mathbf{z} \in N\mathcal{W}^*$ and $\gamma = \gamma(\mathbf{z})$ such that $T(\gamma) = T^{\mathcal{W}}_{N,N+M}$. It follows that

$$T^{\mathcal{W}}_{0,M} \;\leq\; T^{\mathcal{W}}_{0,N+M} \;\leq\; \max\left\{T(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{z}) : \mathbf{z} \text{ with } |\mathbf{z}| \leq \frac{N}{\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{z}})}\right\} + T^{\mathcal{W}}_{N,M+N}.$$

By (1.5), $\mathrm{P}\Big(T^{\mathcal{W}}_{0,M} < M(1-\epsilon/2)\Big) \to 0$ as $M \to \infty$. Thus, it suffices to prove that

$$\mathrm{P}\left(\max\left\{T(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{z}) : \mathbf{z} \text{ with } |\mathbf{z}| \leq \frac{N}{\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{z}})}\right\} > \epsilon M/4\right) \to 0, \quad \text{as } M \to \infty. \tag{3.11}$$

However, the event in (3.11) is contained in the event $\{N\mathcal{W}^* \not\subseteq \mathcal{W}_{\epsilon M/4}\}$. According to the Shape Theorem, the probability of this event tends to zero as $M \to \infty$ for any $N \leq (1-\delta)\epsilon M/4$, and $\delta > 0$. Hence, the result follows for any $\eta < \epsilon/4$. $\square$

Proof of Proposition 1.5. Fix $\epsilon > 0$. Let $X^{(1)}_{N,N+M}, X^{(2)}_{N,N+M}, \ldots, X^{(Q)}_{N,N+M}$ and $C < \infty$ be as in Lemma 3.4, and choose $\eta = \eta(\epsilon)$ according to Lemma 3.5. Let

$$N = \min\left(\eta M, \left\lfloor \frac{M\epsilon}{4C} \right\rfloor\right).$$

Markov's inequality and independence give that for any $\gamma > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{P}\left(\sum_{q=1}^{Q} X^{(q)}_{N,N+M} < n(1-\epsilon)\right) \;&\leq\; e^{\gamma n(1-\epsilon)}\, \mathrm{E}\left[e^{-\gamma X^{(1)}_{N,N+M}}\right]^Q \\ &\leq\; e^{\gamma(M+CN)(1-\epsilon)} \left[e^{\gamma(M+CN)(1-\epsilon)} \left(e^{-\gamma M(1-\epsilon/2)} + \mathrm{P}\Big(X^{(1)}_{N,N+M} < M(1-\epsilon/2)\Big)\right)\right]^Q. \end{aligned}$$

Since $CN - M\epsilon/2 \leq -M\epsilon/4$, the expression within square brackets is at most

$$e^{-\gamma M\epsilon/4} + e^{(1+\eta C)\gamma M}\mathrm{P}\Big(X^{(1)}_{N,N+M} < M(1-\epsilon/2)\Big). \tag{3.12}$$

According to Lemma 3.5 we can make this expression arbitrarily small by chosing γ and M such that γM is large and M is as large as necessary. Fix γ and M such that $N \geq 1$ and (3.12) is at most

$$(2C)^{-d} \max\left(\frac{2}{\eta}, \frac{8C}{\epsilon}\right)^{-d} \leq \left(2C\frac{M}{N}\right)^{-d}.$$

Appealing to Lemma 3.4 with these γ, M and N, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{P}\Big(T^{\mathcal{W}}_{0,n} < n(1-\epsilon)\Big) &\leq e^{\gamma(M+CN)} \sum_{(Q+1)\geq n/(M+CN)} n^{d-1}\left(C\frac{M}{N}\right)^{d(Q-1)}\left(2C\frac{M}{N}\right)^{-dQ} \\ &\leq e^{\gamma(M+CN)}\cdot n^{d-1}\cdot 2^{-d(n/(M+CN)-1)+1}, \end{aligned}$$

which is of the required form. ☐

4 Radial convergence on cones

In this section we prove that we have almost sure, L^1 and complete convergence in any radial direction on cone-like subgraphs of the $\mathbb{Z}^d$ lattice. The result will be stated next, and extends several of the previous results stated for the $\mathbb{Z}^d$ lattice. It is the first step in the proof of Theorem 1.2.

Proposition 4.1. *Let* $\hat{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$*, and* $\omega : [0,\infty) \to [0,\infty)$ *be any function such that* $\omega(a) \to \infty$ *as* $a \to \infty$*. Let* $\mathcal{G}$ *denote the subgraph of the* $\mathbb{Z}^d$ *lattice induced by the set* $\bigcup_{a\geq 0} B\big(a\hat{\mathbf{x}}, \omega(a)+R_d\big)$*.*

a) If $\mathrm{E}[Y] < \infty$*, then* $\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{T_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{0}, n\hat{\mathbf{x}})}{n} = \mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{x}})$*, almost surely and in* L^1*.*

b) If $\alpha \geq 1$ *and* $\mathrm{E}[Y^\alpha] < \infty$*, then*

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^{\alpha-2}\mathrm{P}\Big(\big|T_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{0}, n\hat{\mathbf{x}}) - n\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{x}})\big| > n\epsilon\Big) < \infty, \quad \textit{for any } \epsilon > 0.$$

Two comments. We will not explicitly prove that $\mathrm{E}[Y] < \infty$ is sufficient for the almost sure convergence to hold, but rather remark at the end of the proof on how this can be obtained. That $\mathrm{E}[Y^2] < \infty$ is sufficient follows from part *b)* and Borel-Cantelli's lemma.

In case $\hat{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathbb{U}^{d-1}$, we can easily bound the passage time on the cone between the passage time on the full lattice and the passage time on a tube. However, in case $\hat{\mathbf{x}} \notin \mathbb{U}^{d-1}$, we do not know that we have convergence on the tube. Therefore we will have to make use of a shifting trick.

Proof. Let $\hat{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ and $\epsilon > 0$. Next, choose $\hat{\mathbf{z}} \in \mathbb{U}^{d-1}$ such that both $|\hat{\mathbf{z}} - \hat{\mathbf{x}}| \leq \epsilon$ and $\big|\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{z}}) - \mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{x}})\big| \leq \epsilon/3$, choose $K \geq R_d + 1$ such that $\mu_K(\hat{\mathbf{z}}) \leq \mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{z}}) + \epsilon/3$, and choose n such that $n|\hat{\mathbf{z}} - \hat{\mathbf{x}}| > 2K + 3\sqrt{d}/2$ and $\big|\,\mathrm{E}\big[\tilde{T}_K(\mathbf{0}, n\hat{\mathbf{z}})\big] - n\mu_K(\hat{\mathbf{z}})\big| \leq n\epsilon/3$. This is possible according to (2.3), and Proposition 2.9 and 2.8, in that order. In particular, for the $\hat{\mathbf{z}}$, K and n chosen,

$$\Big|\mathrm{E}\big[\tilde{T}_K(\mathbf{0}, n\hat{\mathbf{z}})\big] - n\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{x}})\Big| \leq n\epsilon. \tag{4.1}$$

We will need to bound $T_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{0}, m\hat{\mathbf{x}})$ from below and above by known entities. In order to obtain an upper bound, choose an integer $M = M(K,n)$ such that $\omega(x) \geq K + n + \sqrt{d}/2$ for all $x \geq M$. Let $\mathbf{x}_n = (n\hat{\mathbf{x}})^*$, i.e., the point in $\mathbb{Z}^d$ closest to $n\hat{\mathbf{x}}$. By the choice of M, it is clear that for $m \geq M$, the subgraph induced by $\bigcup_{a\in[0,n]} B(a\hat{\mathbf{z}}+\mathbf{x}_m, K)$ is a subgraph of $\mathcal{G}$. Therefore, together with subadditivity, it is clear that

$$\begin{aligned} T_{\mathcal{G}}\big(\mathbf{0},(M+kn)\hat{\mathbf{x}}\big) \;\leq\; & T_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{x}_M)+\sum_{j=0}^{k-1}\tilde{T}_K(\mathbf{x}_{M+jn},\mathbf{x}_{M+jn}+n\hat{\mathbf{z}}) \\ & +\sum_{j=0}^{k-1}\tilde{T}_K(\mathbf{x}_{M+jn}+n\hat{\mathbf{z}},\mathbf{x}_{M+(j+1)n}). \end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

Recall that $|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}^*|<\sqrt{d}$. Since $\big|(\mathbf{x}_{M+jn}+n\hat{\mathbf{z}})^*-\mathbf{x}_{M+(j+1)n}\big| \geq n|\hat{\mathbf{z}}-\hat{\mathbf{x}}|-3\sqrt{d}/2>2K$, the summands in each of the two sums in the above expression are independent. A lower bound on $T_{\mathcal{G}}\big(\mathbf{0},(M+kn)\hat{\mathbf{x}}\big)$ is obtained from $T\big(\mathbf{0},(M+kn)\hat{\mathbf{x}}\big)$. Now, given $m\geq M$, set $m=M+k_mn+a_m$ for integers $k_m\geq 0$ and $a_m\in[0,n)$. The triangle inequality and subadditivity gives

$$\begin{aligned} \left|\frac{T_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{0},m\hat{\mathbf{x}})}{m}-\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{x}})\right| \;\leq\; & \left|\frac{T(\mathbf{0},m\hat{\mathbf{x}})}{m}-\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{x}})\right|+\frac{T_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{0},m\hat{\mathbf{x}})-T(\mathbf{0},m\hat{\mathbf{x}})}{m} \\ \leq\; & 2\left|\frac{T(\mathbf{0},m\hat{\mathbf{x}})}{m}-\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{x}})\right|+\frac{\tilde{T}_K\big((M+k_mn)\hat{\mathbf{x}},m\hat{\mathbf{x}}\big)}{m} \\ & +\left(\frac{T_{\mathcal{G}}\big(\mathbf{0},(M+k_mn)\hat{\mathbf{x}}\big)}{m}-\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{x}})\right). \end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

When (4.2) is substituted into (4.3), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left|\frac{T_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{0},m\hat{\mathbf{x}})}{m}-\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{x}})\right| \;\leq\; & 2\left|\frac{T(\mathbf{0},m\hat{\mathbf{x}})}{m}-\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{x}})\right|+\frac{\tilde{T}_K\big((M+k_mn)\hat{\mathbf{x}},m\hat{\mathbf{x}}\big)}{m} \\ & +\frac{T_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{x}_M)}{m}+\left(\frac{1}{k_m}\sum_{j=0}^{k_m-1}\frac{\tilde{T}_K(\mathbf{x}_{M+jn},\mathbf{x}_{M+jn}+n\hat{\mathbf{z}})}{n}-\frac{\mathrm{E}\big[\tilde{T}_K(\mathbf{0},n\hat{\mathbf{z}})\big]}{n}\right) \\ & +\left(\frac{\mathrm{E}\big[\tilde{T}_K(\mathbf{0},n\hat{\mathbf{z}})\big]}{n}-\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{x}})\right)+\frac{1}{k_m}\sum_{j=0}^{k_m-1}\frac{\tilde{T}_K(\mathbf{x}_{M+jn}+n\hat{\mathbf{z}},\mathbf{x}_{M+(j+1)n})}{n}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

Denote the terms in the right-hand side of (4.4) by $X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_6$.

Part *a)*. Assume that $\mathrm{E}[Y]<\infty$, and let m tend to infinity. Proposition 3.3 tells us that $\mathrm{E}[X_1]\to 0$. Since $|\mathbf{x}_m-\mathbf{x}_{M+k_mn}|\leq\sqrt{d}+\big|m-(M+k_mn)\big|<\sqrt{d}+n$, for $m\geq M$, and $\mathrm{E}\big[\tilde{T}_K(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{z})\big]<\infty$ when $|\mathbf{z}|<\sqrt{d}+n$, it is clear that $\mathrm{E}[X_2]$ vanishes as $m\to\infty$. Since $\mathrm{E}\big[T_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{x}_M)\big]<\infty$, also $\mathrm{E}[X_3]$ vanishes. The fourth term is the average of k_m i.i.d. random variables, minus their mean. Its mean is therefore zero. The only terms that do not vanish as $m\to 0$, are the last two. The fifth term is constant, and at most ϵ, due to (4.1). The final term X_6 is an average of independent random variables, each of which is distributed according to one of a finite number of possible distributions. Since

$$\big\|(\mathbf{x}_{M+jn}+n\hat{\mathbf{z}})^*-\mathbf{x}_{M+(j+1)n}\big\|_1 \;\leq\; d\big(3\sqrt{d}/2+n|\hat{\mathbf{z}}-\hat{\mathbf{x}}|\big) \;\leq\; 2dn\epsilon,$$

due to the choice of n, we obtain for each $j \geq 0$ that

$$\frac{1}{n}\,\mathrm{E}\left[\tilde{T}_K\big(\mathbf{x}_{M+jn} + n\hat{\mathbf{z}}, \mathbf{x}_{M+(j+1)n}\big)\right] \;\leq\; 2d\,\mathrm{E}\left[\tilde{T}_{K-1}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{e}_1)\right]\epsilon. \tag{4.5}$$

Hence, we conclude that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \mathrm{E}\left|\frac{T_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{0}, m\hat{\mathbf{x}})}{m} - \mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{x}})\right| \;\leq\; \Big(2d\,\mathrm{E}\left[\tilde{T}_{K-1}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{e}_1)\right] + 1\Big)\epsilon.$$

Since $\epsilon > 0$ was arbitrary, this proves the L^1-convergence in part *a)*.

Part *b)*. Assume that $\mathrm{E}[Y^\alpha] < \infty$. We aim to prove that for each $j = 1, 2, \ldots, 6$,

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^{\alpha-2}\mathrm{P}(X_j > \epsilon) < \infty. \tag{4.6}$$

For $j = 1$, this follows combining Proposition 1.3 and 1.4. Since $\mathrm{E}\left[\tilde{T}_K(0, \mathbf{z})^\alpha\right] < \infty$ for any $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, and $\tilde{T}_K\big((M + k_m n)\hat{\mathbf{x}}, m\hat{\mathbf{x}}\big)$ is distributed according to one of finitely many possible distributions (as m varies), it follows from (2.5) that (4.6) holds for $j = 2$. For $j = 3$, (4.6) follows also from (2.5). For $j = 4$ the same follows from Theorem 3.1, since the terms in X_4 are i.i.d. The term X_5 is again constant, so $j = 5$ is fine. For $j = 6$ we do not quite have (4.6). However, since the terms in X_6 are i.i.d. with finite moment of order α, and can be dominated by a random variable with mean at most $2d\,\mathrm{E}\left[\tilde{T}_{K-1}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{e}_1)\right]\epsilon$, as in (4.5), we have

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^{\alpha-2}\mathrm{P}\Big(X_6 > \Big(2d\,\mathrm{E}\left[\tilde{T}_{K-1}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{e}_1)\right] + 1\Big)\epsilon\Big) < \infty.$$

We conclude that

$$\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} n^{\alpha-2}\mathrm{P}\left(\left|\frac{T_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{0}, m\hat{\mathbf{x}})}{m} - \mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{x}})\right| > \Big(2d\,\mathrm{E}\left[\tilde{T}_{K-1}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{e}_1)\right] + 6\Big)\epsilon\right) < \infty.$$

Since $\epsilon > 0$ was arbitrary, the proof is complete. □

Remark 4.2. Here comes an explanation of how to see that $\mathrm{E}[Y] < \infty$ is sufficient for the almost sure convergence in Proposition 4.1. It is easily deduced from (1.5) (or Proposition 1.4) that $\liminf_{n\to\infty} T_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{0}, n\hat{\mathbf{x}})/n \geq \mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{x}})$ almost surely. The reason we cannot draw the conclusion we wish directly from (4.4) is that we have not yet proved that $\mathrm{E}[Y] < \infty$ is sufficient for convergence of $T(\mathbf{0}, m\hat{\mathbf{x}})/m$. However, we do not need to know that in order to show, when $\mathrm{E}[Y] < \infty$, that $\limsup_{n\to\infty} T_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{0}, n\hat{\mathbf{x}})/n \leq \mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{x}})$. To see this, bound $T_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{0}, m\hat{\mathbf{x}})$ from above as in (4.2), and obtain an upper bound similar to (4.4), that does not include $T(\mathbf{0}, m\hat{\mathbf{x}})$. Of course, from this it follows that also $\lim_{m\to\infty} T(\mathbf{0}, m\hat{\mathbf{x}})/m$ exists when $\mathrm{E}[Y] < \infty$. □

5 Dynamical stability of radial convergence

In this section we consider dynamical first-passage percolation. The key in order to understand how dynamical first-passage times behaves, will be to compare them to non-dynamical first-passage times. We will start to introduce some notation that will be in force for the rest of this section. Recall that $\{\tau_e(s)\}_{e\in\mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{Z}^d}}$ denotes the i.i.d. family of dynamical passage times associated with the $\mathbb{Z}^d$ lattice. Let $N_e = N_e(\delta)$ denote the number or updates of $\tau_e(s)$ on the interval $[0,\delta]$. Clearly $N_e \sim \text{Poisson}(\delta)$ and $\mathrm{E}[N_e] = \delta$. Define

$$\bar{\tau}_e := \tau_e(0)\cdot 1_{\{N_e(\delta)=0\}}, \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\tau}_e := \sup_{s\in[0,\delta]} \tau_e(s).$$

Let $\bar{T}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})$ denote the passage time between $\mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{y}$ on $\mathcal{G}$ with respect to $\{\bar{\tau}_e\}_{e\in\mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{Z}^d}}$, and let $\hat{T}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})$ denote the passage time between $\mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{y}$ on $\mathcal{G}$ with respect to $\{\hat{\tau}_e\}_{e\in\mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{Z}^d}}$. Clearly, for any $\delta \geq 0$, and $\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}\in\mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\bar{T}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) \;\leq\; T^{(s)}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) \;\leq\; \hat{T}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}), \quad \text{for all } s\in[0,\delta].$$

The first thing we do will be to compare moments.

Lemma 5.1. *For $\delta\geq 0$, $\alpha\geq 0$ and $q\geq 1$*

$$\mathrm{E}\left[\min\left(\sup_{s\in[0,\delta]}\tau_1(s),\ldots,\sup_{s\in[0,\delta]}\tau_q(s)\right)^{\alpha}\right] \;\leq\; (1+\delta)^q\,\mathrm{E}\Big[\min\big(\tau_1(0),\ldots,\tau_q(0)\big)^{\alpha}\Big],$$

where $\tau_1(s),\tau_2(s),\ldots,\tau_q(s)$ are i.i.d. and distributed as $\tau_e(s)$.

Proof. Since $\mathrm{E}[X^\alpha] = \int_0^\infty n^{\alpha-1}\mathrm{P}(X>x)\,dx$ and $\mathrm{P}\big(\min(X_1,\ldots,X_m)>x\big) = \mathrm{P}(X_1>x)^m$ for i.i.d. non-negative random variables $X,X_1,\ldots,X_m$, the result follows from the following observation.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{P}\left(\sup_{s\in[0,\delta]}\tau_e(s)>x\right) &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\mathrm{P}\left(\max_{j=1,\ldots,k+1}\tau_e^{(j)}>x\,\middle|\,N_e=k\right)\mathrm{P}(N_e=k)\\
&\leq \sum_{k=0}^{\infty}(k+1)\mathrm{P}(\tau_e>x)\mathrm{P}(N_e=k)\\
&= \mathrm{P}(\tau_e>x)\,\mathrm{E}[1+N_e].
\end{aligned}$$

□

The first step in order to prove a dynamically stable version of the Shape Theorem is to show that the almost sure convergence in radial directions is dynamically stable.

Proposition 5.2. *Let $\hat{\mathbf{x}}\in\mathbb{S}^{d-1}$, and $\omega:[0,\infty)\to[0,\infty)$ be any function such that $\omega(a)\to\infty$ as $a\to\infty$. Let $\mathcal{G}$ denote the subgraph of the $\mathbb{Z}^d$ lattice induced by the set $\bigcup_{a\geq 0}B\big(a\hat{\mathbf{x}},\omega(a)+R_d\big)$. If $\mathrm{E}[Y]<\infty$, then, almost surely, for every $\epsilon>0$, there exists an $M=M(\epsilon)<\infty$ such that*

$$\left|\frac{T^{(s)}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{0},n\hat{\mathbf{x}})}{n}-\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{x}})\right|<\epsilon, \quad \textit{for all } s\in[0,1] \textit{ and } n\geq M.$$

The proof of this proposition is heavily inspired by the proof of the dynamical version of the Law of Large Numbers due to Benjamini et al. (2003).

Proof. Fix $\epsilon > 0$. Let $\hat{Y}$ denote the minimum of $2d$ independent variables distributed as $\hat{\tau}_e$. According to Lemma 5.1, $\mathrm{E}[Y] < \infty$ implies $\mathrm{E}[\hat{Y}] < \infty$, so the time constants $\bar{\mu}_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{x}})$ and $\hat{\mu}_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{x}})$ defined as limits of first-passage times with repect to $\{\bar{\tau}_e\}_{e\in\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Z}^d}}$ and $\{\hat{\tau}_e\}_{e\in\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Z}^d}}$, respectively, exist and are finite. As δ tends to zero, the distributions of $\bar{\tau}_e = \bar{\tau}_e(\delta)$ and $\hat{\tau}_e = \hat{\tau}_e(\delta)$ converges weakly to the distribution of τ_e. Hence, by Proposition 2.1 we can choose $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\left|\hat{\mu}_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) - \bar{\mu}_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{x}})\right| < \epsilon/2.$$

According to Proposition 4.1 we can, almost surely, find $M = M(\epsilon, \delta) < \infty$ such that for all $n \geq M$

$$\left|\frac{\bar{T}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{0}, n\hat{\mathbf{x}})}{n} - \bar{\mu}_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{x}})\right| < \frac{\epsilon}{2}, \quad \text{and} \quad \left|\frac{\hat{T}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{0}, n\hat{\mathbf{x}})}{n} - \hat{\mu}_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{x}})\right| < \frac{\epsilon}{2}.$$

We conclude that

$$\left|\frac{T^{(s)}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{0}, n\hat{\mathbf{x}})}{n} - \mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{x}})\right| < \epsilon, \quad \text{for all } s \in [0, \delta] \text{ and } n \geq M.$$

The result in now obtained by covering $[0, 1]$ by finitely many intervals of length δ. ☐

Similarly, one may derive a dynamically stable version of Proposition 2.8.

Proposition 5.3. *For $K \geq R_d$, $\hat{\mathbf{z}} \in \mathbb{U}^{d-1}$ and $\mathrm{E}[Y] < \infty$, almost surely, for every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists an $M = M(\epsilon) < \infty$ such that*

$$\left|\frac{T^{(s)}_{K,\hat{\mathbf{z}}}(\mathbf{0}, n\hat{\mathbf{z}})}{n} - \mu_K(\hat{\mathbf{z}})\right| < \epsilon, \quad \textit{for all } s \in [0, 1] \textit{ and } n \geq M.$$

Proof. The proof is analogous to the proof of Proposition 5.2. The reader may see that it goes through smoothly replacing the reference to Proposition 4.1 with Proposition 2.8, and Proposition 2.1 with its analogue for $(K, d, \hat{\mathbf{z}})$-tubes, which can be found in Ahlberg (2010). ☐

6 Extending the Shape Theorem to cones

The proofs of Theorem 1.2 and 1.6 will naturally follow the proof of the Shape Theorem closely. We follow the approach given in Howard (2004). An essential step in the proof of the Shape Theorem, and subsequently in order to prove Theorem 1.2 and 1.6, is to show that

$$\sum_{\mathbf{z}\in\mathbb{Z}^d} \mathrm{P}\big(T(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{z}) \geq M|\mathbf{z}|\big) < \infty, \quad \text{for some } M > 0. \tag{6.1}$$

Under the assumption of finite exponential moment, that is $\mathrm{E}[e^{\theta\tau_e}] < \infty$ for some $\theta > 0$, this follows by standard large deviation estimates for i.i.d. sequences. Cox and Durrett (1981) showed that

$$\mathrm{E}[Y^d] < \infty \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \sum_{\mathbf{z}\in\mathbb{Z}^d} \mathrm{P}\big(T(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{z}) \geq M|\mathbf{z}|\big) < \infty, \quad \text{for some } M > 0. \tag{6.2}$$

Let $Y(\mathbf{z})$ denote the minimum over the passage times of the $2d$ edges connected to $\mathbf{z}$. When $\mathrm{E}[Y^d] = \infty$, in fact $T(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{z}) \geq Y(\mathbf{z})$ implies

$$\sum_{\mathbf{z}\in(2\mathbb{Z})^d} \mathrm{P}\big(T(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{z}) \geq M|\mathbf{z}|\big) \;\geq\; \sum_{\mathbf{z}\in(2\mathbb{Z})^d} \mathrm{P}\big(Y(\mathbf{z}) \geq M|\mathbf{z}|\big) \;=\; \infty$$

for any $M < \infty$. This proves one implication. Moreover, the Borell-Cantelli lemma gives that $T(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{z})/|\mathbf{z}| > M$ for infinitely many $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. This shows that $\mathrm{E}[Y^d] < \infty$ is necessary also for (1.4) to hold.

The remaining direction of (6.2) requires more work. The proof can be simplified if we make the somewhat stronger assumption $\mathrm{E}[\tau_e^2] < \infty$ (as in Kesten (1986)).

Lemma 6.1. *Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a graph, and let $\mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{y}$ be two vertices connected with q disjoint paths, each of length at most λ. If $\mathrm{E}[\tau_e^2] < \infty$, then*

$$\mathrm{P}\Big(T_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) \geq \big(\mathrm{E}[\tau_e] + 1\big)\lambda\Big) \;\leq\; \left(\frac{\mathrm{E}[\tau_e^2]}{\lambda}\right)^q.$$

(Since there on the $\mathbb{Z}^d$ lattice are $2d$ disjoint paths from $\mathbf{0}$ to $\mathbf{z}$ of length of order $\|\mathbf{z}\|_1$, Lemma 6.1 implies that $\mathrm{E}[\tau_e^2] < \infty$ is sufficient for (6.1) to hold.)

Proof. Denote the disjoint paths by $\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2, \ldots, \Gamma_q$. Note that

$$\mathrm{E}\left[T(\Gamma_j)\right] \;\leq\; \mathrm{E}[\tau_e]\lambda, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathrm{Var}\left(T(\Gamma_j)\right) \;\leq\; \mathrm{Var}(\tau_e)\lambda \;\leq\; \mathrm{E}[\tau_e^2]\lambda$$

for all $j = 1, \ldots, q$. Since $T_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) \leq T(\Gamma_j)$ for each j, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{P}\Big(T_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) \geq \big(\mathrm{E}[\tau_e] + 1\big)\lambda\Big) \;&\leq\; \prod_{j=1}^{q} \mathrm{P}\Big(T(\Gamma_j) \geq \big(\mathrm{E}[\tau_e] + 1\big)\lambda\Big) \\ &\leq \left(\frac{\mathrm{E}[\tau_e^2]\lambda}{\lambda^2}\right)^q, \end{aligned}$$

where we in the last step have applied Chebyshev's inequality. ☐

We will prove part *b)* and *c)* of Theorem 1.2, and Theorem 1.6, under the additional assumption that $\mathrm{E}[\tau_e^2] < \infty$. The stronger assumption will be used in order to derive Lemma 6.2 from Lemma 6.1. The main ideas are still present, and the remaining piece needed to obtain Lemma 6.2 with the relaxed condition $\mathrm{E}[Y^d] < \infty$ is indicated in Remark 6.4.

6.1 Proof of Theorem 1.2

Let $S_{\mathcal{G}} := \big\{\hat{\mathbf{u}} \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1} : (a\hat{\mathbf{u}})^* \in \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{G}} \text{ for all } a \text{ large enough}\big\}$. Clearly $\hat{\mathbf{x}} \in S_{\mathcal{G}}$, and if $\lim_{a\to\infty} \omega(a)/a = 0$, then $S_{\mathcal{G}} = \{\hat{\mathbf{x}}\}$. Fix $\epsilon \in \big(0, \frac{1}{3\sqrt{d}}\big)$. Choose $\hat{\mathbf{u}}^{(1)}, \dots, \hat{\mathbf{u}}^{(m)} \in S_{\mathcal{G}}$ such that for some $M_1 < \infty$

$$\bigcup_{j=1}^{m} \bigcup_{a\geq 0} B\big(a\hat{\mathbf{u}}^{(j)}, \epsilon a\big) \ \supseteq \ \bigcup_{a\geq M_1} B\big(a\hat{\mathbf{x}}, \omega(a) + R_d\big).$$

If $S_{\mathcal{G}} = \{\hat{\mathbf{x}}\}$, then $m = 1$, $\hat{\mathbf{u}}^{(1)} = \hat{\mathbf{x}}$, and we may directly apply Proposition 4.1 to obtain desired convergence of $\big|T_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{0}, n\hat{\mathbf{x}}) - n\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{x}})\big|$. If instead $S_{\mathcal{G}} \neq \{\hat{\mathbf{x}}\}$, then we can choose $\hat{\mathbf{u}}^{(1)}, \dots, \hat{\mathbf{u}}^{(m)} \in S_{\mathcal{G}} \cap \mathbb{U}^{d-1}$ such that they are interior points in $S_{\mathcal{G}}$ (seen as a subset of $\mathbb{S}^{d-1}$). Then there are $\delta > 0$ and $M_2 = M_2(\delta) < \infty$ such that

$$\bigcup_{a\geq M_2} B\big(a\hat{\mathbf{u}}^{(j)}, \delta a + R_d\big) \ \subseteq \ \bigcup_{a\geq 0} B\big(a\hat{\mathbf{x}}, \omega(a) + R_d\big), \quad \text{for each } j = 1, \dots, m.$$

Choose $a_j \geq M_2$ such that $a_j\hat{\mathbf{u}}^{(j)} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. In particular,

$$\Big|T_{\mathcal{G}}\big(\mathbf{0}, n\hat{\mathbf{u}}^{(j)}\big) - n\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{u}}^{(j)})\Big| \ \leq \ T_{\mathcal{G}}\big(\mathbf{0}, a_j\hat{\mathbf{u}}^{(j)}\big) \ + \ \Big|T_{\mathcal{G}}\big(a_j\hat{\mathbf{u}}^{(j)}, n\hat{\mathbf{u}}^{(j)}\big) - n\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{u}}^{(j)})\Big|.$$

We conclude from Proposition 4.1 that when $\mathrm{E}[Y] < \infty$, then

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{T_{\mathcal{G}}\big(\mathbf{0}, n\hat{\mathbf{u}}^{(j)}\big)}{n} = \mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{u}}^{(j)}), \qquad \text{almost surely and in } L^1, \text{ for each } j = 1, 2, \dots, m. \tag{6.3}$$

Moreover, when $\mathrm{E}[Y^\alpha] < \infty$, for some $\alpha \geq 1$, we also obtain that

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^{\alpha-2}\mathrm{P}\Big(\big|T_{\mathcal{G}}\big(\mathbf{0}, n\hat{\mathbf{u}}^{(j)}\big) - n\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{u}}^{(j)})\big| > n\epsilon\Big) < \infty, \quad \text{for each } j = 1, 2, \dots, m. \tag{6.4}$$

Set $\hat{\mathbf{z}} = \mathbf{z}/|\mathbf{z}|$. For $\hat{\mathbf{z}}$ close to $\hat{\mathbf{u}}^{(j)}$, we will compare $T_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{z})$ with $T_{\mathcal{G}}\big(\mathbf{0}, a\hat{\mathbf{u}}^{(j)}\big)$, for a suitably chosen. Define

$$H_n := \Big\{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|\mathbf{y}\|_\infty := \max_{j=1,2,\dots,d} |y_j| = n\Big\}.$$

Given $\mathbf{z} \in H_n$, let $j(\mathbf{z})$ denote that of the indices $j = 1, 2, \dots, m$ that minimizes $\big|\hat{\mathbf{z}} - \hat{\mathbf{u}}^{(j)}\big|$. With a slight abuse of notation we write $\hat{\mathbf{u}}^{(\mathbf{z})}$ for $\hat{\mathbf{u}}^{(j(\mathbf{z}))}$. Denote by $\mathbf{u}_{\mathbf{z}}$ the point in $H_n \cap \mathbb{Z}^d$ closest to the unique point in $H_n \cap \{a\hat{\mathbf{u}}^{(\mathbf{z})}\}_{a\geq 0}$.

Claim 1. *If $\epsilon \in \big(0, \frac{1}{3\sqrt{d}}\big)$ and $\mathbf{z} \in H_n$, then*

$$|\mathbf{u}_{\mathbf{z}} - \mathbf{z}| \ \leq \ 8dn\epsilon + \sqrt{d} \ \leq \ 8d|\mathbf{z}|\epsilon + \sqrt{d}.$$

Proof of Claim 1. This claim is easily proven with trigonometry, observing that the angle α at which the line $\{a\hat{\mathbf{u}}^{(\mathbf{z})}\}_{a\geq 0}$ intersects H_n satisfies $\tan(\alpha) \geq \sqrt{d}$, the extremal case being $\hat{\mathbf{u}}^{(\mathbf{z})} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}(1, \dots, 1)$. The details are left to the reader. $\square$

By subadditivity

$$\begin{aligned}\Big|T_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{z}) - |\mathbf{z}|\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{z}})\Big| \;\le\; & \Big|T_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{z}) - T_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{u_z})\Big| + \Big|T_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{u_z}) - |\mathbf{u_z}|\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{u}}^{(\mathbf{z})})\Big| \\ & + \; \mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{u}}^{(\mathbf{z})})\Big||\mathbf{u_z}| - |\mathbf{z}|\Big| + |\mathbf{z}|\Big|\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{u}}^{(\mathbf{z})}) - \mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{z}})\Big|.\end{aligned} \tag{6.5}$$

The latter two terms in the right-hand side of (6.5) are non-random. Claim 1 gives

$$\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{u}}^{(\mathbf{z})})\Big||\mathbf{u_z}| - |\mathbf{z}|\Big| \;\le\; \mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{u}}^{(\mathbf{z})})|\mathbf{u_z} - \mathbf{z}| \;\le\; \mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{u}}^{(\mathbf{z})})\big(8d|\mathbf{z}|\epsilon + \sqrt{d}\big), \tag{6.6}$$

and, by (2.3), $|\mathbf{z}|\big|\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{u}}^{(\mathbf{z})}) - \mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{z}})\big|$ is bounded from above by

$$|\mathbf{z}|d \;\mathrm{E}\big[T(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{e}_1)\big]|\hat{\mathbf{u}}^{(\mathbf{z})} - \hat{\mathbf{z}}| \;\le\; |\mathbf{z}|d\;\mathrm{E}\big[T(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{e}_1)\big]\epsilon/\sqrt{1-\epsilon^2} \;\le\; 2d\;\mathrm{E}\big[T(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{e}_1)\big]\;|\mathbf{z}|\epsilon. \tag{6.7}$$

The first term in the right-hand side of (6.5) is, again by subadditivity, at most

$$\Big|T_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{z}) - T_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{u_z})\Big| \;\le\; T_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{u_z},\mathbf{z}).$$

Proof of part *a)*. Assume that $\mathrm{E}[\tau_e] < \infty$. Since $\|\mathbf{z}\|_1 \le d|\mathbf{z}|$, we conclude via Claim 1 that

$$\mathrm{E}\big[T_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{u_z},\mathbf{z})\big] \;\le\; \mathrm{E}[\tau_e]\,\|\mathbf{u_z} - \mathbf{z}\|_1 \;\le\; d\;\mathrm{E}[\tau_e]\,\big(8d|\mathbf{z}|\epsilon + \sqrt{d}\big).$$

Under the assumption that $\mathrm{E}[\tau_e] < \infty$, also $\mathrm{E}[Y] < \infty$. So, (6.3) assure that when $|\mathbf{z}|$, and then also $|\mathbf{u_z}|$, is sufficiently large, then $\mathrm{E}\Big|T_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{u_z}) - |\mathbf{u_z}|\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{u}}^{(\mathbf{z})})\Big| \le |\mathbf{u_z}|\epsilon$, which in turn is at most $(1+8d\epsilon)|\mathbf{z}|\epsilon + \sqrt{d}\epsilon$. Finally, together with (6.6) and (6.7), we have obtained that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{E}\Big|T_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{z}) - |\mathbf{z}|\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{z}})\Big| \;\le\; & \Big(8d^2\;\mathrm{E}[\tau_e] + (1+8d\epsilon) + 8d\,\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{u}}^{(\mathbf{z})}) + 2d\;\mathrm{E}\big[T(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{e}_1)\big]\Big)|\mathbf{z}|\epsilon \\ & + \big(d\;\mathrm{E}[\tau_e] + \epsilon + \mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{u}}^{(\mathbf{z})})\big)\sqrt{d},\end{aligned}$$

for $|\mathbf{z}|$ large enough. Since $\epsilon > 0$ was arbitrary, this proves *a)*. □

In order to prove either of the remaining two parts, *b)* and *c)*, the pending step is to prove a variant of (6.1). With the approach we have chosen, we will prove the following.

Lemma 6.2. *Let the notation above be in force and assume that* $\mathrm{E}[\tau_e^2] < \infty$. *There exists* $M < \infty$*, that does not depend on* ϵ*, such that*

$$\sum_{\mathbf{z}\in\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{G}}} \mathrm{P}\big(T_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{u_z},\mathbf{z}) \ge M|\mathbf{z}|\epsilon\big) < \infty.$$

Since not every vertex of $\mathcal{G}$ has the same degree, we will need the following classification.

Claim 2. *There is a partition* $D_0, D_1, \ldots, D_{d-1}$ *of the vertices in* $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{G}}$*, such that for some* $C < \infty$*,*

$$\big|D_q \cap H_n\big| \le \begin{cases} Cn^{q-1}, & \text{for } q = 1,2,\ldots,d-1, \\ Cn^{d-1}, & \text{for } q = 0. \end{cases}$$

and if $\mathbf{z} \in D_q \cap H_n$ *for some* $n, q \ge 1$*, then there is a* $\mathbf{v_z} \in D_0 \cap H_n$ *such that* $\|\mathbf{v_z} - \mathbf{z}\|_1 \le C$*, and there exist (at least)* q *disjoint paths between* $\mathbf{z}$ *and* $\mathbf{v_z}$ *of length* $\|\mathbf{v_z} - \mathbf{z}\|_1$*. For* $\mathbf{z} \in D_0$ *there are* $2d$ *disjoint paths from* $\mathbf{z}$ *to* $\mathbf{u_z}$ *of length at most* $C\|\mathbf{u_z} - \mathbf{z}\|_1$*.*

Remark 6.3. In most cases it is possible to choose D_q such that $\big|D_q \cap H_n\big| \le Cn^{q-2}$ for $q \ge 2$, and $D_1 = \emptyset$. (When $\hat{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{e}_1$ this is always possible.) However, there are cases when this is not possible. For example, when $d = 3$ and $\hat{\mathbf{x}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(1,1,1)$, it is possible to choose ω such that the intersection of $\mathcal{V}_\mathcal{G}$ with $\{-R_d\} \times \mathbb{Z}^2$ equals the points along the line $\big\{a(0,1,1) + (-R_d,0,0)\big\}_{a \ge 0}$. These vertices will only have one neighbour. □

Proof of Claim 2. We will prove the case when $\omega(a) = c \cdot a$ and $\hat{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{e}_1$ only, and leave it to the reader to verify that the proof extends to the remaining cases. There are three cases: $c > 1$, $c = 1$ and $c < 1$. In the first case set $D_0 := \mathcal{V}_\mathcal{G} = \mathbb{Z}^d$. In the second case set $D_0 := \mathcal{V}_\mathcal{G} = \{0, 1, \ldots\} \times \mathbb{Z}^{d-1}$ and $D_{d-1} := \{-R_d, -R_d + 1, \ldots, -1\} \times \mathbb{Z}^{d-1}$. Both these cases are easy, but the final case is more tricky. In that, let

$$D_0 := \big\{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{V}_\mathcal{G} : B(\mathbf{z}, R_d) \subseteq \mathcal{V}_\mathcal{G}\big\} = \bigcup_{a \ge 0} B(a\mathbf{e}_1, c \cdot a). \tag{6.8}$$

(Here and below we identify subsets of $\mathbb{R}^d$ with its restriction to $\mathbb{Z}^d$.) Since H_n is a $(d-1)$-dimensional subset of $\mathbb{R}^d$, then there is an $C_1 < \infty$ such that

$$|D_0 \cap H_n| \;\le\; |H_n| \;\le\; C_1 n^{d-1}, \quad \text{and} \quad \big|(\mathcal{V}_\mathcal{G} \setminus D_0) \cap H_n\big| \;\le\; C_1 n^{d-2}.$$

For $q = 1, 2, \ldots, d-1$ we define

$$D_q := \big\{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{V}_\mathcal{G} \setminus D_0 :\ z_j \ne 0 \text{ for } q \text{ indices } j \ge 2\big\}.$$

Since $\mathcal{V}_\mathcal{G} \setminus D_0 = \big(\bigcup_{a \ge 0} B(a\mathbf{e}_1, c \cdot a + R_d)\big) \setminus \big(\bigcup_{a \ge 0} B(a\mathbf{e}_1, c \cdot a)\big)$, it is clear that fixation of $z_j = 0$ for some $j \ge 2$ in $\mathcal{V}_\mathcal{G} \setminus D_0$ reduces the degree of freedom (in the choise of $\mathbf{z}$) by one, in the sense that going from D_{q+1} to D_q we loose one dimension. Hence, there is a $C_2 < \infty$

$$|D_q \cap H_n| \le C_2 n^{q-1}, \quad \text{for each } q = 1, 2, \ldots, d-1.$$

Move on to the second part of the statement. Take $\mathbf{z} \in D_q \cap H_n$. Due to lattice symmetry, we may assume that $z_j \ge 0$ for all $j = 1, 2, \ldots, d$. We will choose $\mathbf{v}_\mathbf{z}$ suitably in the rectangle

$$\mathcal{R}_\mathbf{z} = \Big\{\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{V}_\mathcal{G} \cap H_n :\ z_1 \le v_1 \le n, \text{ and } 0 \le v_j \le z_j \text{ for } j \ge 2\Big\}.$$

Due to (6.8) we can find $C_3 < \infty$ such that, for $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{R}_\mathbf{z}$, if $z_1 + C_3 \le v_1 \le n$, or if $v_1 = n$ and $|\mathbf{v} - n\mathbf{e}_1| \le |\mathbf{z} - n\mathbf{e}_1| - C_3$, then $\mathbf{v} \in D_0$. Choose $\mathbf{v}_\mathbf{z}$ accordingly. Since $\mathbf{v}_\mathbf{z}$ and $\mathbf{z}$ differ in q coordinates, it is easy to find q disjoint paths from $\mathbf{v}_\mathbf{z}$ to $\mathbf{z}$ of length $\|\mathbf{v}_\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{z}\|_1$.

It remains to conclude that there are $2d$ disjoint paths between $\mathbf{z} \in D_0$ and $\mathbf{u}_\mathbf{z}$. This follows directly from Lemma 2.4, since $\bigcup_{a \in [0,1]} B\big(\mathbf{u}_\mathbf{z} + a(\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{u}_\mathbf{z}), R_d\big) \subseteq \mathcal{V}_\mathcal{G}$. □

Proof of Lemma 6.2. Let $1 \le C < \infty$ and $D_0, D_1, \ldots, D_{d-1}$ be as in Claim 2. We will treat each D_q separately, starting with $q = 0$. Claim 1 says that $\|\mathbf{u}_\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{z}\|_1 \le 8dn\epsilon + \sqrt{d}$ for $\mathbf{z} \in H_n$. Via Lemma 6.1 we deduce that for $\mathbf{z} \in D_0 \cap H_n$

$$\mathrm{P}\Big(T_\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{u}_\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{z}) \ge \big(\mathrm{E}[\tau_e] + 1\big) C (8dn\epsilon + \sqrt{d})\Big) \;\le\; |D_0 \cap H_n| \left(\frac{\mathrm{E}[\tau_e^2]}{n\epsilon}\right)^{2d},$$

and, since $|D_0 \cap H_n| \leq Cn^{d-1}$,

$$\sum_{\mathbf{z} \in D_0} \mathrm{P}\Big(T_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{u_z}, \mathbf{z}) \geq \big(\mathrm{E}[\tau_e] + 1\big) C(8d|\mathbf{z}|\epsilon + \sqrt{d})\Big) \;\leq\; C \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^{d-1} \left(\frac{\mathrm{E}[\tau_e^2]}{n\epsilon}\right)^{2d} \;<\; \infty.$$

For each $\mathbf{z} \in D_q \cap H_n$, where $q \geq 1$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{P}\Big(T_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{u_z}, \mathbf{z}) \geq \big(\mathrm{E}[\tau_e] + 2\big) C(8dn\epsilon + \sqrt{d} + C)\Big) &\leq \mathrm{P}\Big(T_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{v_z}, \mathbf{z}) \geq n\epsilon\Big) \\ &+ \mathrm{P}\Big(T_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{u_z}, \mathbf{v_z}) \geq \big(\mathrm{E}[\tau_e] + 1\big) C(8dn\epsilon + \sqrt{d} + C)\Big). \end{aligned}$$

Let $\mathcal{T}_q$ denote the minimum passage times of q disjoint paths of length C. Since $\|\mathbf{v_z} - \mathbf{z}\|_1 \leq C$, then $\mathrm{P}\big(T_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{v_z}, \mathbf{z}) \geq n\epsilon\big)$ is at most as large as $\mathrm{P}(\mathcal{T}_q \geq n\epsilon)$. Thus,

$$\sum_{\mathbf{z} \in D_q \cap H_n} \mathrm{P}\Big(T_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{v_z}, \mathbf{z}) \geq n\epsilon\Big) \;\leq\; |D_q \cap H_n| \mathrm{P}(\mathcal{T}_q \geq n\epsilon) \;\leq\; Cn^{q-1} \mathrm{P}(\mathcal{T}_q \geq n\epsilon),$$

which, summing over n, is finite, since $\mathrm{E}[\mathcal{T}_q^q] < \infty$. Moreover, $\|\mathbf{u_z} - \mathbf{v_z}\|_1 \leq 8dn\epsilon + \sqrt{d} + C$, and an application of Lemma 6.1 gives that

$$\sum_{\mathbf{z} \in D_q \cap H_n} \mathrm{P}\Big(T_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{u_z}, \mathbf{v_z}) \geq \big(\mathrm{E}[\tau_e] + 1\big) C(8dn\epsilon + \sqrt{d} + C)\Big) \;\leq\; |D_q \cap H_n| \left(\frac{\mathrm{E}[\tau_e^2]}{n\epsilon}\right)^{2d}.$$

Again $|D_q \cap H_n| \leq Cn^{q-1}$, and we conclude that for each $q \geq 1$

$$\sum_{\mathbf{z} \in D_q} \mathrm{P}\Big(T_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{u_z}, \mathbf{z}) \geq \big(\mathrm{E}[\tau_e] + 2\big) C(8d|\mathbf{z}|\epsilon + \sqrt{d} + C)\Big) < \infty.$$

Hence, it suffices to choose $M = \big(\mathrm{E}[\tau_e] + 3\big) 8Cd$. □

Remark 6.4. The condition in Lemma 6.2 can be relaxed to $\mathrm{E}[Y^d] < \infty$. That is essentially obtained by showing that the set D_0 can be chosen in a way that under the relaxed condition

$$\sum_{\mathbf{z} \in D_0} \mathrm{P}\big(T_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{u_z}, \mathbf{z}) \geq M|\mathbf{z}|\epsilon\big) < \infty,$$

for some $M < \infty$ not depending on ϵ. To see that this is true, consult Lemma 2.4 and the paper of Cox and Durrett (1981, Lemma 3.3). □

Recall that complete convergence implies almost sure convergence.

Proof of part *b)* and *c)*. Assume that $\mathrm{E}[\tau_e^2] < \infty$. We will prove that

$$\sum_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{G}}} \mathrm{P}\Big(\big|T_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{u_z}) - |\mathbf{u_z}| \mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{u}}^{(\mathbf{z})})\big| > |\mathbf{z}|\epsilon\Big) < \infty. \tag{6.9}$$

Once this is done, it will follow from (6.5) and Lemma 6.2 that

$$\sum_{\mathbf{z}\in\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{G}}} \mathrm{P}\bigg(\Big|T_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{z})-|\mathbf{z}|\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{z}})\Big| > \Big(M+1+(8d+\sqrt{d})\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{u}}^{(\mathbf{z})})+2d\,\mathrm{E}\big[T(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{e}_1)\big]\Big)|\mathbf{z}|\epsilon\bigg) < \infty.$$

Since $\epsilon > 0$ has been arbitrarily chosen, this would prove *c)*, and therefore also *b)*.

In order to prove (6.9), note that $\mathbf{u}_{\mathbf{z}}$ may obtain the same value for at most $|H_n|$ vertices $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{G}}$. Since $|H_n| = 2d(2n)^{d-1}$, then (6.9) follows easily from (6.4), given that $E[Y^{d+1}] < \infty$. However, that indeed holds since $\mathrm{E}[\tau_e^2]$ is assumed finite, according to (2.6). $\square$

6.2 Proof of Theorem 1.6

Assume that $\mathrm{E}[\tau_e^2] < \infty$. Only minor adjustmenst are necessary in order to obtain Theorem 1.6 from the proof of Theorem 1.2. We proof will proceed along the same lines. For $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{G}}$, set $\hat{\mathbf{z}} = \mathbf{z}/|\mathbf{z}|$. The statement we will prove is that, almost surely, for every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $M = M(\epsilon) < \infty$ such that

$$\left|\frac{T_{\mathcal{G}}^{(s)}(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{z})}{|\mathbf{z}|} - \mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{z}})\right| < \epsilon, \quad \text{for all } s\in[0,1] \text{ and } |\mathbf{z}| \geq M. \tag{6.10}$$

This is sufficient for Theorem 1.6 to follow.

Fix $\epsilon \in \big(0, \frac{1}{3\sqrt{d}}\big)$. Let $\hat{\mathbf{u}}^{(1)}, \ldots, \hat{\mathbf{u}}^{(m)} \in S_{\mathcal{G}}$ be chosen as in the proof of Theorem 1.2. It follows directly from Proposition 5.2 that there exists an almost surely finite $M = M(\epsilon)$ such that

$$\left|\frac{T_{\mathcal{G}}^{(s)}(\mathbf{0},n\hat{\mathbf{x}})}{n} - \mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{x}})\right| < \epsilon, \quad \text{for all } s\in[0,1] \text{ and } n \geq M.$$

For $\hat{\mathbf{u}}^{(j)} \in S_{\mathcal{G}} \cap \mathbb{U}^{d-1}$ that are interior points in $S_{\mathcal{G}}$, we may again choose a_j large, such that

$$\left|\frac{T_{\mathcal{G}}^{(s)}\big(\mathbf{0},n\hat{\mathbf{u}}^{(j)}\big)}{n} - \mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{u}}^{(j)})\right| \leq \frac{T_{\mathcal{G}}^{(s)}\big(\mathbf{0},a_j\hat{\mathbf{u}}^{(j)}\big)}{n} + \left|\frac{T_{\mathcal{G}}^{(s)}\big(a_j\hat{\mathbf{u}}^{(j)},n\hat{\mathbf{u}}^{(j)}\big)}{n} - \mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{u}}^{(j)})\right|,$$

and where the right-hand side is, almost surely, at most ϵ uniformly in $s \in [0,1]$, for sufficiently large n, again according to Proposition 5.2. That is, there is an almost surely finite $M = M(\epsilon)$ such that

$$\left|\frac{T_{\mathcal{G}}^{(s)}\big(\mathbf{0},n\hat{\mathbf{u}}^{(j)}\big)}{n} - \mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{u}}^{(j)})\right| < \epsilon, \quad \text{for all } s\in[0,1],\ j=1,2,\ldots,m \text{ and } n \geq M. \tag{6.11}$$

For any given $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{G}}$, let $\mathbf{u}_{\mathbf{z}}$ be specified as before. Analogously to (6.5) we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\Big|T_{\mathcal{G}}^{(s)}(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{z})-|\mathbf{z}|\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{z}})\Big| \;\leq\; & T_{\mathcal{G}}^{(s)}(\mathbf{u}_{\mathbf{z}},\mathbf{z}) + \Big|T_{\mathcal{G}}^{(s)}(\mathbf{0},\mathbf{u}_{\mathbf{z}})-|\mathbf{u}_{\mathbf{z}}|\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{u}}^{(\mathbf{z})})\Big| \\ & +\ \mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{u}}^{(\mathbf{z})})\Big||\mathbf{u}_{\mathbf{z}}|-|\mathbf{z}|\Big| + |\mathbf{z}|\Big|\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{u}}^{(\mathbf{z})})-\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{z}})\Big|.\end{aligned} \tag{6.12}$$

According to (6.11), for $s \in [0,1]$, the second term in the right-hand side of (6.12) is not greater than $|\mathbf{u}_\mathbf{z}|\epsilon \leq (1+8d\epsilon)|\mathbf{z}|\epsilon + \sqrt{d}\epsilon$ whenever $|\mathbf{u}_\mathbf{z}| \geq \big(|\mathbf{z}| - \sqrt{d}\epsilon\big)/(1+8d\epsilon) \geq M$. Recall the notation introduced in Section 5. Since

$$T_\mathcal{G}^{(s)}(\mathbf{u}_\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{z}) \;\leq\; \hat{T}_\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{u}_\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{z}),$$

and $\mathrm{E}[\hat{\tau}_e^2] < \infty$ whenever $\mathrm{E}[\tau_e^2] < \infty$, it follows from Lemma 6.2 and Borel-Cantelli's lemma that there is an $M' < \infty$ such that

$$\sup_{s\in[0,1]} T_\mathcal{G}^{(s)}(\mathbf{u}_\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{z}) \;\leq\; \hat{T}_\mathcal{G}^{(s)}(\mathbf{u}_\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{z}) \;\leq\; M'|\mathbf{z}|\epsilon$$

for all but finitely many $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{V}_\mathcal{G}$. From all of the above, we conclude that there is an almost surely finite $M'' = M''(\epsilon)$ such that when $|\mathbf{z}| \geq M''$

$$\left|\frac{T_\mathcal{G}^{(s)}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{z})}{|\mathbf{z}|} - \mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{z}})\right| \leq \Big(M' + (1+8d\epsilon) + 8d\mu_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\hat{\mathbf{u}}^{(\mathbf{z})}) + 2d\ \mathrm{E}\big[T(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{e}_1)\big] + 1\Big)\epsilon, \quad \text{for all } s \in [0,1].$$

Since $\epsilon > 0$ was arbitrary, this proves (6.10). ☐

Acknowledgements: The author would like to thank Olle Häggström for suggesting the dynamical version of first-passage percolation, as well as Robert Morris for a helpful discussion.

References

D. Ahlberg. Asymptotics of first-passage percolation on 1-dimensional graphs. Licentiate thesis, avalible at `http://www.math.chalmers.se/Math/Research/Preprints/2008/39.pdf`, 2008.

D. Ahlberg. Asymptotics of first-passage percolation on 1-dimensional graphs. Avalible at `http://arxiv.org/abs/1107.2276`, 2010.

I. Benjamini, G. Kalai, and O. Schramm. Noise sensitivity of Boolean functions and applications to percolation. *Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math.*, 90:5–43, 1999.

I. Benjamini, O. Häggström, Y. Peres, and J. E. Steif. Which properties of a random sequence are dynamically sensitive? *Ann. Probab.*, 31:1–34, 2003.

S. Chatterjee and P. Dey. Central limit theorem for first-passage percolation time across thin cylinders. Avaliable at `http://arxiv.org/pdf/0911.5702`, 2009.

J. T. Chayes and L. Chayes. Percolation and random media. In K. Osterwalder and R. Stora, editors, *Les Houches Session XLIII 1984: Critical phenomena, random systems and gauge theories*. Elsevier, Amsterdam, 1984.

Y. Chow and Y. Zhang. Large deviations in first-passage percolation. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 13: 1601–1614, 2003.

J. T. Cox. The time constant of first-passage percolation on the square lattice. *Adv. in Appl. Probab.*, 12:864–879, 1980.

J. T. Cox and R. Durrett. Some limit theorems for percolation processes with necessary and sufficient conditions. *Ann. Probab.*, 9:583–603, 1981.

J. T. Cox and H. Kesten. On the continuity of the time constant of first-passage percolation. *J. Appl. Probab.*, 18:809–819, 1981.

M. Fekete. Über die Verteilung der Wurzeln bei gewissen algebraischen Gleichungen mit ganzzahligen Koeffizienten. *Math. Z.*, 17:228–249, 1923.

C. Garban, G. Pete, and O. Schramm. The Fourier spectrum of critical percolation. *Acta Math.*, 205:19–104, 2010.

O. Garet and R. Marchand. Large deviations for the chemical distance in supercritical Bernoulli percolation. *Ann. Probab.*, 35:833–866, 2007.

G. Grimmett. Bond percolation on subsets of the square lattice, the transition between one-dimensional and two-dimensional behaviour. *J. Phys. A*, 16:599–604, 1983.

G. Grimmett and H. Kesten. First-passage percolation, network flows and electrical resistances. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 66:335–366, 1984.

A. Gut. *Probability: A graduate course.* Springer-Verlag, New York, first edition, 2005.

O. Häggström, Y. Peres, and J. E. Steif. Dynamical percolation. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.*, 33:497–528, 1997.

J. M. Hammersley and D. J. A. Welsh. First-passage percolation, subadditive processes, stochastic networks and generalized renewal theory. In J. Neyman and L. Le Cam, editors, *Bernoulli, Bayes, Laplace Anniversary Volume*, Proc. Internat. Res. Semin., Statist. Lab., Univ. California, Berkeley, Calif., pages 61–110. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1965.

C. D. Howard. Models of first-passage percolation. In H. Kesten, editor, *Probability on discrete structures*, volume 110 of *Encyclopaedia Math. Sci.*, pages 125–173. Springer, Berlin, 2004.

P. L. Hsu and H. Robbins. Complete convergence and the law of large numbers. *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 33:25–31, 1947.

H. Kesten. Aspects of first-passage percolation. In *École d'Été de Probabilités de Saint Flour XIV - 1984*, volume 1180 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 125–264. Springer, Berlin, 1986.

J. F. C. Kingman. The ergodic theory of subadditive stochastic processes. *J. Roy. Statist. Soc. Ser. B*, 30:499–510, 1968.

D. Richardson. Random growth in a tesselation. *Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.*, 74:515–528, 1973.

O. Schramm and J. E. Steif. Quantitative noise sensitivity and exceptional times for percolation. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 171:619–672, 2010.